

APPEAL

TO

THE UNIVERSITY COURT

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW,

BY

PROFESSOR MACLEOD,

TOGETHER WITH

A NARRATIVE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH
LED TO SAID APPEAL.

c

It is earnestly desired that the members of the University Court will read the statement which follows the Appeal. It is an endeavour to place before them, in a connected form, a narrative of the occurrences which have led up to it.

TO the RIGHT HONOURABLE THE RECTOR and the
OTHER MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT
OF GLASGOW UNIVERSITY, the Petition of PRO-
FESSOR GEO. H. B. MACLEOD appealing against
a decision of the Senate embodied in the
annexed excerpt minute of a meeting held on
14th February, 1878,

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

First, That the decision, although arrived at in a manner which was technically regular, was in reality the decision of a mere fraction of the Senate. It appears from the minute that while only nine (not a quorum of the Senate) voted, seven abstained from voting.

Secondly, That leaving out of account the Professors directly concerned, those who took part in the vote were equally divided, for the majority of five was made up of Drs. Buchanan and Anderson with three others, while the minority also comprised three (not including Dr. Gairdner who was absent) and the Petitioner.

Thirdly, That the course which, in the interests of the University and having regard to the relations subsisting between the Chairs of Surgery and Clinical Surgery, the Senate should have adopted, was not made the subject of a motion.

Fourthly, That the decision arrived at in the manner above mentioned perpetuates an imperfect state of the University Records. The Petitioner acknowledges that this imperfect state of the University Records existed in the sessions 1875-6 and 1876-7, and that for this, in so far as the list of his students is concerned, he is himself *primarily* responsible, but he complains that when he came forward of his own accord to remedy the defect objections were raised to his doing so, and the Senate decided to print the class-lists for the present year in the inaccurate form in which they were allowed to appear in the two preceding sessions.

Fifthly, That this inaccuracy in the class-lists, which the Senate has decided to perpetuate, is detrimental to the interests of the University and especially of the Medical School, inasmuch as it may be the source of erroneous inference as to the number of students seeking clinical instruction from private teachers; for in the event of another University Commission being appointed years hence to inquire into the condition of the University, and especially into the question of extra-mural teaching, information would necessarily be sought, in the absence of other official records, from these imperfect class-lists, and since the majority of the students in the Surgery class-list also receive clinical instruction from the Petitioner, unless this be indicated in the list it might be erroneously inferred, to the prejudice of the Medical School, that a majority of the students had by some cause or other been induced to seek instruction in Clinical Surgery from private teachers.

Sixthly, That this inaccuracy in the class-lists is further detrimental to the interests of the University and especially to the Chair of Surgery, inasmuch as at some future time these imperfect class-lists may, in the absence of, or in spite of, other reliable information, be founded on as proof that, in sessions 1875-6, 1876-7, 1877-8, the giving of clinical instruction did not form an integrant part of the professorial work performed by the holder of the Chair of Surgery.

Seventhly, That the decision of the Senate carries with it an infringement of the equality in regard to clinical teaching which ought to subsist between Dr. Buchanan and the Petitioner.

Eighthly, That the infringement of this equality is a violation of the arrangement under which the Petitioner's consent to the establishment of the Chair of Clinical Surgery was obtained. The nature of this arrangement is evident from the Report of the Committee of Senate appointed to formulate the conditions under which the Chairs might with benefit to the University be founded, adopted by the Senate on April 7th, 1874, and from the correspondence which passed between Dr. Buchanan and the Petitioner, copies of which report and correspondence are to be found in the accompanying narrative, pp. 9 and 12.

Ninthly, That the infringement of this equality is a violation of the rights reserved to the Petitioner in the Deed of Foundation of the Chair of Clinical Surgery. The rights there reserved to the Petitioner are evidently connected with his professorial work, for the clause in the deed cannot be construed as reserving to him the right of acting as a recognized private teacher of Medicine, since this right he had constitutional means of acquiring under the Ordinances without the insertion of any such clause.

Tenthly, That the decision of the Senate, notwithstanding the *caveat* inserted as to not pronouncing on any legal question involved, practically reduces the Petitioner as regards his Clinical Class to the *status* of an extra-mural teacher, and is therefore unjust and oppressive. And that this result was aimed at by Drs. Buchanan and Anderson is evident from the terms in which they objected to the insertion of the Petitioner's Clinical class-list. See narrative, p. 40.

Lastly, That the Petitioner, in so far as his personal rights as Professor of Surgery are concerned, would be content to accept the alternative motion which was lost, because thereby the equality between Dr. Buchanan and himself would not be infringed, yet as a member of the University and interested in the accurate recording of all facts bearing upon the history of the University and of the several classes, the Petitioner would prefer the adoption of a third course which has not yet been brought before the Senate in the form of a motion, namely, the insertion in the printed lists of both Dr. Buchanan's and the Petitioner's Clinical class-list; and accordingly he prays the University Court not only to quash the decision complained of, but also to enjoin the Senate to consider the matter *de novo*, and in their deliberations to keep in view both the interests of the University and the relations which ought to be preserved between Dr. Buchanan and the Petitioner; and your Petitioner will ever pray.

(Signed)

GEO. H. B. MACLEOD.

The following is the Minute of Senate of February 14th, 1878 :

“The Clerk stated that he had received from Dr. Macleod a list of the students attending his clinical class ; that Dr. Buchanan objected to any other list than his own being printed ; that Dr. Macleod, at the suggestion of the Clerk, thereupon modified his proposal to the extent of not insisting upon more than having the names of the students in his clinical class indicated by a distinctive mark in the Surgery class list ; and that Drs. Buchanan and Anderson had lodged formal written objection to any marks of the kind being inserted in the Surgery class list. In these circumstances, the Clerk applied to the Senate for instructions. After statements from Drs. Macleod and Buchanan, Dr. Young moved, that inasmuch as students who are not matriculated students of the University may demand and obtain admission to any of the clinical classes—no clinical class list be printed. Dr. Cleland seconded the motion. At this point, the Principal having to leave the meeting, Dr. W. P. Dickson was appointed chairman. Mr. Blackburn moved as an amendment that, without pronouncing an opinion on any legal question involved, the Senate instruct the Clerk to follow the procedure of last year. This was seconded by Mr. Caird. On a division, four voted for the motion and five for the amendment. Seven members abstained from voting. The amendment was accordingly declared carried. Dr. Macleod protested, and appealed to the University Court for himself and those who might adhere to him.”

NARRATIVE

To accompany DR. MACLEOD'S APPEAL to the UNIVERSITY COURT OF
GLASGOW regarding the resolution of Senate, dated 14th
February, 1878.

It appears to me essential to the proper understanding of the question involved in my appeal against the deliverance of the Senate on the printing of the list of my clinical class that I give a *résumé* of the circumstances which preceded and led up to the question in dispute, and this I shall try to do as shortly as possible.

It will also be conducive to the clearer comprehension of the subject if I state at the outset that the printing of the class lists, which is the ostensible subject of appeal, is only a very small part of the question at issue. The Professor of Clinical Surgery has at various times claimed (1) An exclusive right to teach clinical surgery for graduation purposes ; (2) An exclusive right to examine graduands in clinical surgery (with the aid of the assessor) ; (3) An exclusive right to adjudicate honours in clinical surgery ; (4) " An exclusive right to have his lectures and certificates considered and named as *University* lectures and certificates in clinical surgery ;" (5) The right to have the lists of students attending his class of clinical surgery alone printed in the University Catalogue as representing the surgical clinical class of the University.*

All these pretensions I dispute, and I propose in the following pages to show the grounds and reasons for my contention.

In 1869 I was appointed by the Crown "Professor of Surgery" in the University. One of the unsuccessful candidates was Dr. George Buchanan, then Lecturer on Anatomy in the Andersonian. I was also about the same time appointed to the charge of clinical wards in the Royal Infirmary. I was the only professor at that time connected

* See Appendix, paragraph Nos. 7 and 8.

with the University who held office as surgeon and teacher of clinical surgery in the Royal Infirmary, and consequently on me alone, of the infirmary teachers, devolved the duty of examining (along with an assessor) the University candidates for graduation. Ever since clinical examinations were established the occupant of my chair has examined all candidates for graduation at the University on clinical surgery. From the date of my appointment down to the opening of the Western Infirmary in 1874 I performed these duties, and, so far as the examinations were concerned, I received no remuneration whatever, the duty being looked on as professorial work.*

In January, 1874, the Western Infirmary was approaching completion, and arrangements had to be made regarding its medical staff. It was understood that provision was to be made there for the conduct of clinical teaching connected with the University, and I was repeatedly consulted about the internal arrangements, as one whose services would be called into requisition so soon as the hospital was opened. No other surgeon but myself was at that time in any way associated with the new hospital, but it was of course anticipated that one or two more would be required to complete the surgical staff. It was at this juncture that Dr. George Buchanan called for me and asked me if I would have any objection to receive him as a colleague in the hospital and in the University, and he explained that "a gentleman" was willing to endow a chair of clinical surgery, if it could be established, and he (Dr. Buchanan) was appointed to it. He said that he was very ambitious of getting into the University, and saw no other way of attaining it than this, and that he was tired of teaching anatomy, and wished to devote himself more to surgery. He said further that before coming to me he had sounded some of my colleagues, and that they had declined to discuss the matter till he had seen me, whose consent it was necessary to obtain. Further, he added that if I decided to oppose his scheme he would not prosecute it further. I at once signified my willingness to promote his object, so far as my personal feelings were concerned, but asked time to consider it, as I was bound to look at the question as it would affect the interests of my chair. I said, however, at the very outset, that I would consent to no arrangement which would change my relationship to the clinical teaching; that I would be very glad to share it with him, as the work was too much for one man; but that if he came into the University it must be strictly on the footing of division, and not to displace me

* See Appendix, paragraphs 2 and 10.

in any way from the work in which I was engaged, and of which I was very fond. To this he readily consented, and expressed again and again his desire to "share" the clinical work with me in a friendly spirit. He next inquired if I was willing to support his admission into the Senate, and not merely his nomination as a lecturer. To this I replied that having got the position of professor I had no wish to exclude him. He appeared somewhat astonished at my liberality, and on my putting it to him as to whether, if our places had been changed, he would have acted so to me, he frankly replied he would not. I wrote to him soon after his visit, asking him to put the proposal he had made to me on paper, in order to prevent mistake, and in this communication I repeated what I had before said about his not trenching on my position either in the college or hospital, and his simply sharing the clinical work. I stated that so long as this was adhered to, and everything was carried on in an open and straightforward manner we would not fail to work harmoniously, but that if he or his friends were to make use of his acquired position to weaken or trip me up, I would take every means for my own protection. *In reply to my communication* he wrote the following :—

January 16, 1874.

MY DEAR MACLEOD,—I send you a copy of my letter to the Principal. I have left condition four vague, so that the Senate may decide how it is to be carried out, and in speaking to Dr. Caird and any of your colleagues I have told (*sic*),—I have always mentioned our interview and my wish to come, not as an antagonist, rival, or competitor, but as a colleague and fellow-worker in clinical surgery, and I have said, as I said to you, that I would accept the position if it gave to me an equal amount with you of wards, work, and fees.

It is true that *personally* I am getting the position, and you can only be asked to acquiesce for the sake of the school, but a time must come for both of us in a few years when it may be a relief to us to have the burden shared, as we could do, and even with regard to your own large systematic class it *might* be a relief to your mind to know that in case of illness, or necessary absence, you had a colleague to whom you could delegate your duties without the class suffering very much. I speak from my experience of the last two years.

With regard to keeping it quiet I have no wish that it should be a hole and corner affair, but I suggest for your consideration whether it would not be better that it should be discussed by you and your

colleagues, and of course such of your friends as you think proper to consult, before it becomes matter of public comment.

I still expect that the proposal will go on with satisfaction to us both. I think, however, that the suggestion of my disloyalty would have been better omitted from your letter, as I would infinitely prefer to enter the College as your friend than as your tripper-up behind.*

I am, yours very truly,

GEO. BUCHANAN.

These were, so far as I know, the only communications which at that time passed between us, and the above will clearly show the substance and spirit of our conference and proceedings at that time. No reference whatever, either directly or indirectly, was made to the sanction of the Senate, except in so far that it was tacitly implied.† I may at once say, that if the slightest indication had been shown either then or before the arrangements were completed, that any attempt was to be made to deprive me, or my successors, of the full advantages derived from connection with the clinical teaching, I would at once, and with decision, have taken steps to oppose Dr. Buchanan's project. It is self-evident that to have assented to his wishes on any other footing than one of at least equality in the clinical department, would have been simply suicidal on my part.

Further, let me here state, though for the moment interrupting the course of my narrative, that Dr. Buchanan himself, on 4th November, 1874, gave public proof that these views were entertained by him even after the founding of the chair, (*though that proof he has endeavoured subsequently to suppress*), for on pages 7, 8, and 9 of his published Introductory Lecture the following passages occur:—

"But another reason for the foundation of a chair of clinical surgery is, that it secures to the student the advantage of receiving instruction in surgery from at least two separate teachers of that branch accredited by the University."

"When you have two professors teaching the same subject, though

* The conditions mentioned in the above were a simple repetition of those stated by Dr. Buchanan in his conversation with me, and these were the sole conditions he proposed to me. In Dr. Buchanan's first proposal to the Principal regarding the founding of a chair, it was stated as one of the conditions that he was to be the first occupant. This was afterwards withdrawn for obvious reasons. It will be well to compare the above statement and letter with paragraph in Appendix, No. 11.

† See Appendix, paragraph No. 11.

in a different manner, you are sure to escape the danger of a one-sided view, which you almost unconsciously adopt by listening to the teaching of one man alone."

"But on the other hand, while the University authorities, in founding this chair, have provided for the students a professor whose duty it is to teach clinically, it by no means follows that he has, or is intended to have, a monopoly of the subject. Practical surgery is far too important to be delegated exclusively to one man, and undoubtedly the Professor of Systematic Surgery should have the means of illustrating practically the doctrines which he teaches in his class-room. Accordingly it is intended that the students should receive practical instructions in the wards from both surgeons, attending each alternately for a portion of the session."*

But to return. The scheme thus launched was pushed on during the following weeks, Dr. Allen Thomson chiefly interesting himself in the matter and conducting the negotiations. I clearly expressed to him how much I was alive to the sacrifice I was making in admitting a colleague into my department who might, if he wished, make my position less independent and agreeable than it had been; but I all along said I thought the clinical work was too heavy for one man, and that its division between two would add to its efficient performance, and so to the strength of the school. Dr. Thomson, in all his interviews with me, recognized in the fullest manner the principle that the new professor was not in any way to displace me in the clinical ward, but simply to share the duties with me.

In February the proposal of Dr. Buchanan's brother † to found a chair of Clinical Surgery having been submitted to the University

* It is somewhat curious to know that, while the above passages occur in Dr. Buchanan's inaugural address issued by the University publisher in 1874, he should in 1876 have thought it right to print at another establishment "the substance" of his inaugural address, in which the only change of any consequence (beyond the omission of a passing reference to Dr. Thomson's illness, and some small alterations tending to bring out his opinion that he alone should have control over the clinical work) is the omission of *the last paragraph above quoted*, and one in the 4th page, which ran as follows in the first edition: "Lectures on systematic and clinical surgery may be delivered with advantage to audiences of almost any extent, but the ward teaching can only be given to limited numbers at a time." Also the sentence a little below: "The former duty, that of teaching, has been ably and satisfactorily performed by the surgeons of the Glasgow Royal Infirmary," is somewhat altered in its meaning by the omission of the words "and satisfactorily." The emasculated edition has, I understand, been largely distributed each session to the medical students (Appendix, paragraph 3).

† See Appendix, No. 4.

Court, along with a similar proposal for a chair of Clinical Medicine (see page 1 of Record of Minutes of Senate), was sent to the Senate, and remitted by that body on March 5th to a committee consisting of the Faculties of Medicine and Law to report on the subject (see Minutes of Senate, page 3). That committee reported on April 7th, 1874, the two Faculties sending in separate replies. The report of the Medical Faculty stated that, in the opinion of the Faculty, it "would be for the benefit of the medical school, but that these objects, and the method of giving effect to them, should be carefully considered as regards the details, so as to give security that such new chairs shall in no respect interfere with the claims of the Professors of Surgery and of Medicine, or of any other professors to whom the duty may be delegated, to take part in the clinical instruction given in the Western Infirmary or elsewhere, on behalf of the University." The Law Faculty decided that the establishment of the chair was competent, &c.

The Senate received these reports and remitted them to the Faculty of Medicine (with the Principal), "to bring up at next meeting of Senate a more detailed report as to the arrangements proper to be made to give security that the proposed new chairs shall not trench upon the rights or legitimate claims of the present professors and their chairs."

In the next minute which bears on the subject, that of the meeting of Senate on April 16th, 1874, a "supplementary report" was submitted (see Minutes of Senate, p. 5), and in it the following statement occurs: "They do not think it necessary, in the meantime, to add anything further to their former report, except that in the event of these chairs being founded, the persons appointed should be held bound to deliver two courses of lectures, one in the winter, the other in the summer session, and should agree to submit all details as to fees, terms of teaching, &c., to the jurisdiction of the Senate." These reports were approved and adopted.

On 19th May, 1874, the Senate resolved "to erect, and do accordingly hereby erect, these two chairs, and remit to the Principal, Dr. Allen Thomson, Dr. Gairdner, Mr. Berry, Dr. Macleod, and the Clerk, as a Committee of Senate, to adjust with the donors of the endowments the requisite formal deeds or documents containing the conditions of erection and other necessary details, with power to the Committee to execute the same on behalf of the Senate, and when executed to transmit them to the University Court for their approval,

and in order to enable them to exercise at their first meeting the right of patronage to be thereby conferred upon them."

When these deeds were prepared and ready for signature, time was pressing, as the last meeting of the University Court before the period at which it was anticipated that the new hospital might be opened was about to be held. It being impossible, from the shortness of time at our disposal, to arrange all the details as between the new chairs and those of Medicine and Surgery, before these new chairs were fully established by the completion of the deeds, a personal appeal was addressed by the Principal to Dr. Gairdner (and through him to me), to allow the documents to be signed, and that he and I might, with perfect confidence, rely on the Senate so arranging the details that our claims to full recognition would be protected. To prevent any prejudice to the interests of the school, we agreed to this, but so hurriedly had the signatures to be secured, to enable the deeds to go before the impending meeting of the University Court, that I was summoned from the country by telegraph (May 27th, 1874), and was met by the law agent at the railway station, where I was asked to sign the document without being given time even to read it over. Relying upon the promise of the Principal, as the official head of the University, and one whose personal and official character was a guarantee to us, and upon the apparent good faith of all concerned, I did not hesitate to attach my name; but it is evident that had I been actuated by any selfish consideration, or had I entertained the slightest doubt of the perfect security of my position, I would certainly not have done so.

The Medical Faculty, at a meeting on June 11th, 1874, two days after the induction of the new professors, recorded in the minutes their view, that beds in the Western Infirmary should be allotted, first, to the Professor of Clinical Surgery, and, second, to the Professor of Surgery—the claims of both being thus recognized.

These recommendations of the Medical Faculty were forwarded to the Directors of the Royal Infirmary (with which institution it was then proposed to unite the Western Infirmary), and appear in their minutes in the following form: "So long, however, as the full plan of the Western Infirmary remains incomplete, these professors must be contented with a smaller number of beds than it may be desirable should be made available to them hereafter, when the capacity of the hospital shall be increased. And, keeping in view the advantage of securing the services of other medical officers, as well as the professors

specially appointed by the University, the Medical Faculty is of opinion that, for the present, an average number of not less than 30 beds should be allotted to each of the Professors of Clinical Surgery and Clinical Medicine, and of Systematic Medicine and Surgery, and that in addition not less than 10 should be at the disposal of the Professor of Midwifery (for clinical instruction in the diseases of women and children); thus a minimum of 130 beds, or as many more as may be found necessary in a suitable allocation of the wards, is absolutely required."

"The Medical Faculty are further of opinion that it would be of advantage to the Medical School that the clinical instruction of other physicians and surgeons of the Western Infirmary should be received in part at least as qualifying for the medical degrees of the University. But the extent to which this admission of clinical instruction by extra-academical teachers is to be carried must, like other requirements for University degrees, be left to the decision of the Senatus and the University Court.

"The Professors of Clinical Surgery and Clinical Medicine, and the Professors of the Practice of Physic, Surgery, and Midwifery, are to be considered as medical officers of the Western Infirmary, and as such they shall be entitled to all the usual privileges and advantages presented by the institution, so long as in the opinion of the Senatus and the Managers they continue efficiently to discharge their duties."

Thereupon the Directors of the Royal Infirmary wrote to Mr. Hill, Clerk of the Constitution Committee, Western Infirmary, as follows:—

"The Managers having taken the above paragraph" (that is, the proposal of the Medical Faculty anent extra-mural teaching being received for graduation) "into consideration, instruct me to request that they be informed whether it is intended to curtail or in any way to alter the system by which the certificates of hospital attendance and clinical instruction at the Royal Infirmary have hitherto been recognized, without any restriction, by the University Authorities as qualifying for admission to examination for degrees in medicine at the University."

Mr. Hill referred them to the Senate, and the Clerk of Senate in turn stated that the Senate had not yet considered "the arrangements for the attendance of students," but from Dr. Anderson Kirkwood they received the following reply:—

151 WEST GEORGE STREET,
GLASGOW, 23rd October, 1874.

DEAR SIR,

Your letter to me of date 2nd September was submitted the day before yesterday to a meeting of the University Court, who instruct me to state that it is not, and never was their intention to curtail, or in any way to alter, the system by which certificates of hospital attendance and clinical instruction at the Royal Infirmary have hitherto been recognized, without any restriction, as qualifying for admission to examination for degrees in medicine at the University of Glasgow.

I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

ANDERSON KIRKWOOD, *Secy. G.U.C.*

HENRY LAMOND, Esq.,

Secretary,

Royal Infirmary, Glasgow.

I give the above to show what were the arrangements with the Royal Infirmary at that time, and the same, so far as I am aware, still continue, although the proposed amalgamation between the Infirmaries was not carried out.

On July 30th, 1874, the Senate remitted to the Medical Faculty to report on the duties of the new professors and on the arrangements for clinical instruction during the ensuing session.

On the 17th September the Medical Faculty drew up the report to the Senate on the duties of the Clinical Professors which appears in the Senate minutes of October 9th, 1874. There being at this time some doubt as to the opening of the Western Infirmary in time for the winter session, negotiations had been in progress during the summer and autumn by which the reappointment of the four Professors then acting in the Royal Infirmary might have been secured, had this been required in the interest of the University. In all these negotiations Dr. Gairdner and I were at every step associated with the Clinical Professors, and indeed as the senior officers of the Royal Infirmary may be said to have conducted these negotiations in the interest of the Clinical Professors as much as in our own. The difficulties that arose were due chiefly to the appointment of the Clinical Professors, which was regarded with great distrust by the

Managers of the Royal Infirmary as implying a possible tendency towards a monopoly of the clinical teaching, to the exclusion or undue limitation of extra-academical instruction. At a certain stage of these negotiations we were led to apply to the Senate for instructions, and the Senate accordingly resolved to transmit to the directors of both the Western and the Royal Infirmaries a minute intimating that we were not to apply for re-election in the Royal Infirmary. This was with the view to transferring our services to the new hospital. Further measures were taken by the appointment of a committee, including Dr. Gairdner and myself along with the Clinical Professors, to forward the arrangements at the Western Infirmary. The report of the Medical Faculty as to arrangements for the examinations having been read (see page 17 of Minutes), the Senate authorized "the Medical Faculty to make such arrangements as they see fit to apportion the duties of systematic and clinical examinations among the Professors of Systematic and Clinical Medicine and Surgery, having regard to the equalization of duties and responsibilities among the said Professors." By this, as will be seen, the most perfect equality was established between the Professors of Surgery and Clinical Surgery as regards examinations.*

The proposed terms of arrangement are the strongest evidence of our "bona fides," and inasmuch as the Clinical Professors did not at that time claim, as they have since done, more than an equality of function, the inference seems reasonable either that they have changed their point of view, or that they did not at that juncture consider their project ripe for execution. Not only did I propose that the examination in Clinical Surgery should be divided with Dr. Buchanan, but I also conceded to him half of the examination on Systematic Surgery.

That resolution of Senate has never been rescinded, and I have frequently expressed my wish that it should be carried out in its entirety.

Further, as to the mode of teaching Clinical Surgery and Clinical Medicine, the report of the Medical Faculty (see p. 18 of Minutes) was adopted.

"*First*, Clinical Surgery (as between Professors Macleod and George Buchanan), one surgeon shall deliver a lecture in the Theatre on Tuesday (or other day) at 9 a.m. at which all the students who desire certificates from him must be regularly present. The other surgeon

* See Appendix, No. 5.

shall deliver a lecture in the Theatre on Thursday (or other day) at 9 a.m. at which all the students who desire certificates from him must be regularly present. The students who attend the combined course of both surgeons shall be divided into two equal sections, A and B.

"Section A shall attend one surgeon in the wards during the first half of the session, and the other surgeon during the second half of the session. Section B shall alternate with section A. The attendance of students at the clinical lectures and ward instructions shall be ascertained by calling the roll.

"*Second*, Clinical Medicine to be taught in a similar manner."

On 28th November, 1874, in minute of Medical Faculty, the arrangement for the adjudication of the medals in the clinical department is given. The medallist was to be selected by all the Teachers of Clinical Surgery and the University Assessor (*acting conjointly*). This arrangement was unanimously come to, and no appeal was made from the decision. By an oversight this minute was not presented for confirmation to the Senate, and it will be afterwards seen how the Professor of Clinical Surgery took advantage of that informality to ignore its instruction.

On December 19th, 1874, a committee was appointed by the Medical Faculty to consider arrangements for the clinical work after that winter; but though at the meeting of 22nd December, a report is said to have been given in and its consideration adjourned, no indication of the nature of the report is given.

It was I think about the end of 1874 (not long after the chairs were established) that the first intimation reached me of a desire on the part of the Professor of Clinical Surgery to depart from the arrangements in force. I heard incidentally from Edinburgh that Dr. Buchanan had been in communication with the Senate of that University, in order to find out whether my course of clinical teaching was valid for graduation there, seeing that I taught Systematic Surgery as well as Clinical Surgery, and whether his course of one lecture a week and four ward days would be accepted by them as sufficient without the teaching of any one else. This was the first attempt to shake my position as a teacher of Clinical Surgery, as its aim evidently was to have my tickets refused by the Edinburgh University on the ground that I taught two subjects, but it failed. No hint was given me by Dr. Buchanan of this application.

At another meeting of Medical Faculty it was proposed that he and

Dr. Anderson should have a larger share of the fees than Dr. Gairdner and myself, and that we should be placed on the same footing as extra-mural teachers as regards University recognition—*i.e.*, that our University position should be ignored altogether. These proposals received no countenance from my colleagues, and were withdrawn without being minuted. Dr. Gairdner and myself, however, at that time were prepared to give the Clinical Professors a larger proportion of the clinical fees than we obtained if they did more of the work, but this they refused to do.

At a very early period of my connection with the University, I was asked by the senior students, who were about to graduate, to meet them occasionally in the winter and instruct them in the mode of examining patients. This began, if I mistake not, in 1871, and, therefore, long before the question had been complicated by the appointment, or even the thought of the appointment of a Professor of Clinical Surgery. During the winter of 1874-5, an application was made to me (as before) to renew this work. A certain number of the most advanced students (*men who had a year before completed their surgical clinical studies*) were in the habit of meeting twice a week for mutual examination, and they asked me to give them help for one hour in the week. This I agreed to do. Among themselves, and without any communication with me, they subscribed one guinea each to make me a present for the trouble I had taken. This teaching was carried on in public in the hospital, and, as has been said, it was confined to men who had long passed the department of Clinical Surgery; yet Dr. Buchanan afterwards represented it as a surreptitious proceeding on my part, and an infraction of the principle of divided fees; conveniently forgetting that long before then he himself had sought to violate this principle by proposing at the Medical Faculty to exclude me from participating in the teaching for University purposes, and from examining clinically. He maintained that my having done the work above referred to for the senior students, freed him from all the obligations under which he had come in regard to sharing the work of the clinical department.

Affairs soon took further shape, and the frequent efforts of Dr. Buchanan to advance some claim which I believed opposed to the terms of his agreement, gave rise to much discussion, and led to the proposal of the Medical Faculty on January 9th, 1875, to ask Mr. Berry to give an opinion on the facts of the case. This was expressly stated to be merely a desire to obtain from an independent

person, who was also a lawyer, an aid towards the solution of the questions in dispute, and it was distinctly said not to be (and could not be) taken as an authoritative decision. *Dr. Buchanan protested at the meeting at which this reference was made against Mr. Berry's opinion being considered as deciding anything.* In Dr. Buchanan's memorandum to Mr. Berry, his claim to the exclusive right of giving the clinical lectures recognized by the Ordinances, as well as to the adjudication of honours and examinations for graduation, is for the first time distinctly and formally advanced.

The following is Mr. Berry's opinion, or at least such portions of it as can be found. Neither Mr. Berry nor the Clerk of Medical Faculty possesses a copy, and the part here given is from a copy by Dr. Buchanan: "As regards clinical teaching, taking that term to mean the giving of the qualifying courses in Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery required for graduation by the Ordinance No. 15, I am of opinion that no Professor in the Medical Faculty, with the exception of the Professors of Clinical Medicine and of Clinical Surgery, has *ex-officio* either the duty imposed on him of giving clinical instruction, or the corresponding right to have his lectures recognized as qualifying courses.

"It is no doubt the case, that for some time lectures have been given at the Infirmary by the Professors of Practice of Medicine and of Surgery, and that these lectures have, along with those of other physicians and surgeons appointed by the Managers of the Royal Infirmary, been received by the University as qualifying for graduation; but it is not very long since neither in Medicine nor in Surgery did the University professors attempt to give clinical instruction; and the recognition which the lectures of the professors have received (since to the advantage of the University School they chose to deliver them) has been precisely on the same footing as that given to the lectures of the other medical officers of the Infirmary, and as might have been given to those of other medical professors in the University, had they sought for and obtained appointments as physicians and surgeons to the Infirmary, so as to be in a position to give clinical instruction to the students.

"But while this is the case, and while the Professors of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery are alone, in my opinion, clothed at once with the duty and right (assuming them to have the opportunity of giving qualifying clinical courses), I do not think that the University is precluded from recognizing for graduation clinical lectures

given by such of the other Professors of the Faculty of Medicine, including the Professors of Medicine and Surgery, as may from time to time give such courses."

I shall only remark with regard to the above opinion (1) that with the exception of a short period after Mr. Lister came to Glasgow, and no hospital vacancy was available, the Professors of Medicine and Surgery have without intermission conducted clinical teaching ever since a clinical examination was required for graduation, and for some years before; (2) that the limitation in the deed of institution of the Clinical Chairs, reserving the claims of other Professors to similar teaching, was introduced with special and acknowledged reference to this fact, and in order to continue the services to the University of the present Professors of Medicine and Surgery as clinical teachers; (3) that the arrangement so made was acted upon (without any indication of dissent by the Clinical Professors) through a series of detailed regulations made by the Senate for the joint teaching of clinical classes with strict equality of privilege; (4) that such classes were actually taught.

The contention of the present narrative and argument is, that whatever may be, in respect of title and academic position, the ideal privilege of a Clinical Professor as such (and *that* Mr. Berry's opinion may set forth), the actual status and privilege of the Clinical Professors lately appointed in the University of Glasgow must be taken as practically subject to the conditions of their appointment, and the deed of institution of the chairs. The appeal hereby made to the Court is to give effect to these conditions, and to prevent a violent and unjust invasion of those claims which were specially protected by the deed of institution and acknowledged by the Senate, the Medical Faculty, and the Clinical Professors themselves.

On the 29th of June, 1875, Professor Berry's opinion was received and considered by the Medical Faculty, but no deliverance given upon it. A resolution was, however, passed, making the Clinical Professors generally responsible for arranging the time for the clinical examinations, and the returns connected therewith.

On July 9th, 1875, the question of clinical fees was discussed at the Medical Faculty, and resolutions proposed by me as to clinical arrangements were adopted. These, however, had no immediate bearing on the question under consideration.

On 20th September, 1875, the Medical Faculty decided that the arrangements for the ensuing summer as regards clinical teaching

(which prescribed equality of work and classes in common) were to remain the same as those agreed to on October 9, 1874 (see p. 18 of Minutes).

On October 22, 1875, the Medical Faculty, acting under a remit from the Senate, with full powers, assented to a "proposed arrangement, by which the superintendent of the Western Infirmary is in future to enrol students, and to collect the fees for the clinical lectures"; this assent being accompanied by the "opinion that each teacher should keep a separate roll of the students attending his class, and give a certificate of attendance in the case of each of such students."

Towards the end of 1875, in publishing some clinical lectures in the *Lancet*, I put in the title "University Clinie" (within brackets), in order to show where these lectures were delivered—the Western Infirmary being then new and unknown. I also in the introductory remarks said that my clinical teaching was the complement of my systematic teaching, and pointed out the advantages of being able to illustrate my college lectures by hospital cases. Shortly thereafter I received the following letter from Dr. Anderson Kirkwood, Secretary to the Glasgow University Court:—

*Extract from MINUTE of MEETING of the UNIVERSITY COURT of the
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW, held on the 1st day of December, 1875.*

The following letter was read from Professor G. Buchanan:—

193 BATH STREET,
GLASGOW, 29th November, 1875.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

GENTLEMEN,

I beg respectfully to call your attention to the title of a lecture published by Dr. Macleod in the *Lancet* newspaper, of date 27th November, 1875. I do not claim any monopoly of teaching, but I claim the exclusive right to use the term "University" as applied to lectures, class tickets, certificates of attendance, and certificates of merit in Clinical Surgery. I hold the appointment of Professor of Clinical Surgery directly from the University Court, and the public use of the term "University Clinie," as applied by Dr. Macleod to the clinical instruction which he gives in the Western

Infirmary, forces me to appeal to the University Court to protect the privilege of the Chair of Clinical Surgery.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) GEORGE BUCHANAN,

Professor of Clinical Surgery.

The Court having considered the foregoing letter and its enclosure instruct the Secretary to communicate these to Professor Macleod, and to invite him to lodge with the Secretary, on or before the 7th December curt., any observations he may wish to make on Professor G. Buchanan's letter.

*Extracted by ANDERSON KIRKWOOD,
Secretary, Glasgow University Court.*

The following was my reply :

TO ANDERSON KIRKWOOD, Esq., LL.D.

DEAR SIR,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st curt., enclosing an extract from the minutes of the University Court in reference to a letter they had received from Dr. G. Buchanan, and of which a copy has been sent to me. It appears that Dr. Buchanan has found some cause of complaint in the title of a lecture of mine, which appeared in the *Lancet* of the 27th ulto., and you invite me to send you any observations I may wish to make regarding it. While thanking the Court for their courtesy, I cannot but express my regret that their time should have been occupied with so trifling a matter as Dr. George Buchanan has thought fit to bring before them. I am quite at a loss to understand how Dr. Buchanan could fail to see that no right of his, as Professor of Clinical Surgery, is touched by the words "University Clinic," appearing *within brackets* in that title. The object of my paper was to explain the system of bedside teaching I had for years pursued, and which I believed obviated all the objections which had been recently so strongly advanced, in the medical journals, against the plan followed in other schools, and I wished by so doing indirectly to advance the interests of that school to which I have the honour to belong. The simple and *only* reason I had for putting "University Clinic" at all in the title was to indicate that the Western Infirmary, which is a new, and as yet, unknown, hospital, was the institution which the University students frequented. It was a sort of explanatory note, and therefore, as will be seen, put within brackets. It

never dawned on me that when thus explaining, as it were, the place which the Western Infirmary held in the medical educational machinery of the Glasgow School, I was infringing any right belonging exclusively to Dr. Buchanan. Does Dr. Buchanan, however, mean that that Infirmary is *not* the "University Clinic," or, if it is, that no one but himself is allowed to say so? I would also most respectfully suggest, that the lecture in question was not delivered within the University, and if any umbrage is to be taken to the title, it should be by the Directors of the Western Infirmary and not by Dr. Buchanan. I am not, however, solicitous of contesting such trifles. It was no part of my intention to insert the words objected to, in the rest of the lectures which I have been invited to publish. I only desired in the introductory one to indicate, as I have already said, the connection which exists between the Western Infirmary and the University. I do not consider myself called upon to make any remarks on the rest of Dr. Buchanan's communication regarding his claims to the exclusive use of certain phrases which he enumerates. The resolutions and minutes of the Medical Faculty have, for practical purposes, already sufficiently disposed of these and other demands of his. I cannot fail, however, to note with satisfaction that the claim he recently addressed to the Medical Faculty to have all participation by me in the official teaching and examination on Clinical Surgery for University purposes disallowed, has been in his present communication judiciously repudiated.

I am, Sir, &c.,

(Signed)

G. H. B. MACLEOD.

In a further letter to the University Court, Dr. Buchanan says: "It is in consequence of Dr Macleod's public claim in the printed extract I annexed, to have his lectures considered and named University Lectures on Clinical Surgery, which I had considered finally disposed of by Mr. Berry's opinion, that I place the matter before the University Court in the hope that they may see their way to pass some sort of resolution to the effect that the Clinical Professors have the exclusive right to have their lectures and certificates considered and named as *University* lectures and certificates in Clinical Surgery and Medicine.

I am, etc.,

(Signed)

GEO. BUCHANAN.

The University Court took no steps in the matter.*

On November 6th, 1875, the subject of clinical medals and certificates was again taken up by the Medical Faculty, when the following motion was made by Dr. George Buchanan, seconded by Dr. Alex. Dickson, "and adopted as follows:—

'That those students only who attend the lectures of the Clinical Professors for a period of not less than three months shall be entitled to compete for the University clinical medals and certificates of merit.' It was resolved to adjourn the meeting for the further consideration of the details of the arrangements as to the medals.

(Signed) P. A. SIMPSON.

"13th November, 1875.—The adjourned discussion as to arrangements for the clinical medals was resumed. The following was moved by Dr. Macleod, seconded by Dr. Gairdner, and by a majority agreed to, viz.:—

'The University medals and certificates in Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery shall be given to the best students in the classes of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery. The teachers in Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery to select, in concert, a short list of students whom they deem most distinguished. The students so selected to be subjected to a final competitive examination by the Clinical Professors assisted by the Clinical Teachers. The final award to be made by the Professors of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery.' "

On November 25th, 1875, Drs. Buchanan and M'Call Anderson tabled a protest against the resolutions come to at the preceding meeting. It was in the following terms: "Glasgow, 16th November, 1875. To the Medical Faculty of the University of Glasgow, *per* Dr. P. A. Simpson, Clerk.—Dear Sir,—Although we do not propose, at present, to take any further steps in reference to the decision of the Medical Faculty, at their meeting on 13th November, 1875, as to the method of awarding University medals and certificates of merit in Clinical Medicine and Surgery, yet we think it right to state that our present abstinence from action must be regarded as under protest, and without prejudice to the *question being in future raised by ourselves or our successors in office, either in the Medical Faculty or by appeal to the Senate or University Court*; since we do not admit the power of the

* Please compare the above with paragraph 12 of Appendix.

Medical Faculty to limit in any way the privileges belonging to the chairs which we hold. We claim for the Clinical Professors the same privileges in awarding these medals and certificates of merit to the students attending their lectures which are enjoyed by the other Professors in reference to their classes.*

“ We are, your obedient Servants,

(Signed), GEO. BUCHANAN, Prof. Clin. Surg.
 T. M'CALL ANDERSON, Prof. Clin. Med.”

At a meeting of Medical Faculty of March 11th, 1876, the Clinical Professors intimated their intention to give complete qualifying courses of instruction during the summer session—*i.e.*, no longer to be bound by the joint arrangement laid down by the Senate, (see p. 18 of Minutes) but to act independently. This announcement was made in terms which conveyed to the Medical Faculty distinctly, that, in the opinion of the Clinical Professors, it was not a question to be discussed, but a resolution adopted by themselves, and to be carried out on their own authority, without reference to previous arrangements, or to the opinion of their colleagues either individually or collectively. The claims thus set forth appeared to Dr. Gairdner and to me so completely at variance, both with the actual position of the Clinical Professors, as settled by the regulations adopted by the Senate on 9th October, 1874, and with the theory of co-operative teaching in the interest of the University, by which we had been led to assent to the institution of the new chairs, that we immediately protested, and, at the meeting of the Faculty on April 6th, handed in reasons of protest in the following terms:—

“ GLASGOW, March 24th, 1876.

“ Intimation having been made to the Medical Faculty, at a recent meeting, of the intention of the Clinical Professors to give in the ensuing summer each of them a complete and qualifying course of lectures in the Western Infirmary, and some conversation having followed thereupon, the undersigned feel it their duty to protest against this step on the following grounds:—

“ 1st. The Clinical Professors were, by the very conditions of their

*The italics are mine. See paragraphs 14 and 15 of Appendix in which “ *the decision* of the Senate and Court,” which I am stated to have refused to submit to, is given; also observe relation to the facts connected with Mr. Berry's opinion before given.

appointment, bound to teach Clinical Medicine and Surgery, not for their own exclusive benefit, and in their own private interest, but in the interest of the University, and under the direction of the Senate.

“2nd. In the deed of institution of each of the two clinical chairs, a clause was specially introduced and assented to by the promoters of these chairs, as well as by the present incumbents, for the express purpose of reserving the claims of other professors, and particularly of the undersigned, to take part in the clinical instruction of the students of the University.

“3rd. In consequence of this clause, and still more of private assurances received from the leading promoters of the Clinical Professorships (including the present incumbents), the undersigned, who had hitherto conducted a large part of the clinical instruction in the Royal Infirmary, and who regarded this privilege as one of the greatest importance, and one tending greatly to promote the usefulness and efficiency of their own professorships, were induced to become assenting parties to the institution of the Clinical Chairs in the full belief and understanding that their new colleagues would co-operate cordially with them in details, dividing the work of clinical teaching in such a manner as not necessarily to bring about a separation.

“4th. The propriety, and even necessity, of arrangements to this effect were always admitted by the Medical Faculty, and by the Senate of the University, as part of the considerations involved in the constitution of the new chairs; but the details of the arrangements were postponed at the urgent request of the Principal, and on a representation to the undersigned that the Senate had full power to give effect to all regulations in regard to the teaching of the new Professors, which might appear necessary or expedient, in the general interest of the University, or of the previously existing chairs.

“5th. The undersigned were thus led by the whole course of the negotiations for the institution of the Clinical Professors to regard their own claims to a share in the clinical instruction as being fully admitted; and these claims appeared to have received a final sanction from the University when, at the express desire of the Senate, the undersigned were induced to resign their appointments in the Royal Infirmary with the view of receiving conjointly with the Clinical Professors similar appointments in the Western Infirmary previously to its opening in November, 1874.

“6th. On the opening of the Western Infirmary clinical courses of instruction in Medicine and Surgery were immediately instituted

on the principle of conjoint or co-operative teaching by the Clinical Professors and by the undersigned, the students being registered and the roll-call arranged in such a manner as to secure regular attendance not only on clinical lectures, but on a certain number of ward demonstrations by each Professor in each week. In this way the whole available resources in the wards of the two Professors in Medicine and two in Surgery were continuously directed to the training of the students at the bedside, by far the most difficult part of clinical instruction in a large school, and the objects contemplated in the institution of the Clinical Professorships appeared to be accomplished, while at the same time the services of the undersigned as heretofore continued to be recognized, and a much more ample security was given for the continuance of the instruction without interruption in the event of illness or other accident, as actually happened in the course of the year when Dr. Gairdner had to organize and conduct, with the assistance of Dr. Finlayson, the whole of the clinical instruction in Medicine during the lengthened illness of his colleague. All these arrangements made at the time with the consent of the Clinical Professors were sanctioned by the Medical Faculty and received the assent of the *Senatus Academicus*.

"7th. Such being the actual history of these transactions, the undersigned cannot but regard the attempt now disclosed on the part of the Clinical Professors to establish by their own mere motion, without consulting their colleagues, an entirely separate interest in the clinical teaching within the University, as one which ought to be disallowed on the ground of its being opposed to the real and permanent interest of the medical school.

"The undersigned also complain and protest against this attempt, on the ground that it involves distinct breach of faith on the part of the Clinical Professors, being wholly at variance both with their professions and their conduct before and for some time after the institution of the Clinical Chairs."

It ought, perhaps, to be added, that in lodging their protest Dr. Gairdner and I, as we explained to the Medical Faculty at the time, were not in the least influenced by any desire to cling obstinately or exclusively to the system of clinical instruction at first proposed and authorized by the Senate on October 9th, 1874. We had ourselves, in fact, proposed in the Medical Faculty several changes both in regard to fees and duties which we thought might be acceptable to the Clinical Professors and at the same time in accordance with

the principle of joint or co-operative teaching which in the interest, as we believed, of the University we were pledged to maintain. All our efforts in this direction, however, were of no avail. By this time it had become manifest that the Clinical Professors, in disregard of all previous arrangements, were determined to separate their own personal and official interests entirely from ours, both in the matter of teaching and of examination.

Against this we protested, not so much on personal grounds as because of its being a violation of academic order. It seems necessary to bring our views on this point into prominence here in order to show clearly that the apparent position of rivalry or competition with the Clinical Professors in teaching was not at any time one of our seeking. It was brought about partly by the independent action of the Clinical Professors themselves, and partly by the regulations passed by the Managers of the Western Infirmary. Being thus compelled, as it were, to become the unwilling rivals of the colleagues with whom we desired co-operation, we have simply accepted the position.

The proposal to lecture twice weekly was also a direct violation of the Western Infirmary regulations; and when Dr. Buchanan found himself unable to carry out his intention, he based on the merit of giving it up the proposal given below, which he called a "compromise." In resiling from an impossible position, a claim was set up to a concession on my part of all the points in dispute between us. In March, 1876, Dr. Buchanan addressed the following to me: "Agreement between Dr. G. Buchanan and Dr. Macleod as to clinical arrangements. I hereby agree to give only one qualifying lecture on Clinical Surgery in each week, so long as Dr. Macleod continues to lecture on Clinical Surgery—and the University authorities do not interfere with this arrangement on the understanding that Dr. Macleod will do the same—on the following conditions, viz. :— 1st, The adjudication of the University Clinical Medals and Certificates of Merit is to be left to the Clinical Professors as in the case of the other Professors in the Medical Faculty. 2nd, The Clinical Professor is to conduct the examinations for degrees in Clinical Surgery along with the Clinical Examiner appointed by the University Court, and just in the same way as in the case of the other Professors in the Medical Faculty. This part of the agreement is not to interfere with the right which Dr. Macleod has in common with the other Professors of the Medical Faculty to be present at the examination of

the candidate—but Dr. Macleod agrees to exercise that right only occasionally as a matter of form—and to leave the examination practically in the hands of the Clinical Professor and the additional examiner appointed by the Court. 3rd, In the event of Dr. Macleod discontinuing to give clinical lectures, I am to be free to give two qualifying lectures in each week; and Dr. Macleod is to give me sufficient notice of his intention to discontinue to lecture either in the winter or summer sessions.” To that I replied: “I have just received your note, and it is not difficult to reply to it. I unhesitatingly decline your proposal. I am as anxious as you can be to escape from this chronic annoyance, but not by the alternative which you offer, of yielding up to you every point in dispute between us. If, as I hold, you are bound, both as a man of honour, and by your legal claims, to confine yourself to *half* the duties connected with the clinical work, it would certainly be a complete solution of the present difficulty, as I could inform you as well as ——,* if the only two points in debate as to carrying out that arrangement—the examinations and certificates—were given up to you as you propose. Truly, it would be an immediate and complete solution! *No one at the Medical Faculty ever suggested that* but yourself and Dr. Anderson. What was proposed was that you should have *the chief say* at both examinations—that you should preside and take the lead in the management of this part of our work,—*nothing more was proposed, and nothing more can be asked or conceded.* I said, and say now, that whenever I found my rights and position, as regards these examinations, fully admitted, I would be too glad to interfere as little as possible; but I will never consent to be (by written contract) a mere cipher in affairs I have as much to do with the labour of as you have. When you are teaching Systematic Surgery in the University alongside of me, I will be most glad that you take a full share in every part of the duty connected with that department, and even as it is, I would be very much pleased to share it with you. Besides all this, I decline to enter into any arrangement in which Dr. Gairdner is not also a party. Whatever proposals are addressed to me must also go to him on the medical side. I am also not prepared to sign any agreement at so short a notice as you ask it—whatever the proposal may be. No arrangement made now can affect the regulations for this session, and we have plenty of time to decide future proceedings. What your intentions are during the summer, I, personally, have very

* I here referred to a colleague, whose opinion Dr. Buchanan had quoted.

little interest in, as I believe it will not in any way influence the hospital arrangements, under which we both must act, however we like it. If it were not the distinct breach of faith which I consider involved in the question, I would not care a straw whether you lectured once, or six times a week. If you give, or are allowed to give, a qualifying course, so can I, and nothing is gained or lost to either; but what hurts me to the quick, is this further attempt to depart from an understanding which you yourself proposed, and which *you know in your conscience* was the sole foundation of my dealings with you, and the terrible want of fair dealing you have shown towards me, who met your early proposals with so much frankness and generosity. It is this which vexes my soul. I do not despair of some solution of the difficulty, but it is not found in your present proposal."

It turned out that Dr. Anderson had sent a similar document to Dr. Gairdner.

The next move on the part of the Clinical Professors was to issue tickets of their own (notwithstanding the decision of the Medical Faculty of date October 5th, 1875) separate from those of their colleagues;—the same ticket having hitherto been signed by each of the medical officers whose instructions the students attended. This ticket purported to be issued by the University and not the Western Infirmary. The Infirmary authorities objected to this, and at the meeting of the Medical Faculty on March 31st, 1876, the Clinical Professors were instructed to sign the ordinary Infirmary tickets.

It is instructive as showing the *spirit* which pervaded all these proceedings, to mention that Dr. Buchanan had endeavoured to secure the right of signing the joint tickets before me in all cases, and had unsuccessfully applied to the Infirmary authorities in May, 1875, to have his name inserted first in all their notices and lists, because the initial of his name occurred in the alphabet before mine, because he was older than myself and filled the chair of Clinical Surgery!

In this he ignored the fact that my name had been placed first because my connection with the University before his entrance into it had naturally secured my nomination before his, and that I was considerably his senior as Professor.

At the Senate meeting of April 28th, 1876, "Dr. Anderson called attention to the fact that in the University Prize List, and under the title Clinical Medicine, the designation of his chair, certain prizes given in connection with Dr. Gairdner's lectures in the Western Infirmary had been inserted." Dr. Gairdner explains that the

occasion of this apparent anomaly was as follows:—On the day preceding the issue of the list, and in the very act of revising his proof, Dr. Gairdner was informed by the Registrar that Dr. Anderson objected to the publication of Dr. Gairdner's prizes in the University list, and especially under the heading of Clinical Medicine, side by side with his own. Thereupon Dr. Gairdner immediately offered to place his list as a supplement to the prize list in the Practice of Medicine Class, but was told by the Registrar that this too was objected to by Dr. Anderson. Ultimately the Senate agreed to this last proposal, though the fact does not appear in the minute, and the Calendar was issued accordingly. The Calendar Committee were instructed to remove the words objected to from the prize list to be inserted in the Calendar, and Dr. Anderson also gave notice of motion for following meeting to have a committee appointed "to indicate the duties and position of the Clinical Professors, including all collateral questions having reference to prizes, prize lists, advertisements, &c."

On May 10th, 1876, a committee was appointed by the Senate "to indicate the duties and position of the Clinical Professors, including all collateral questions having reference to prizes, prize lists, advertisements, &c.," as requested by Dr. M'Call Anderson, and it was recommended to that committee to "ascertain the view of the other Professors, especially of those concerned."

On November 13th, 1876, "the Committee unanimously resolved, in view of the intricate questions involved in the Senate's remit, and to prevent the committee's labour being lost, to represent to the Senate the expediency of the latter obtaining from the Professors more especially concerned, before the matter is taken up in detail, a pledge to the effect that they are prepared to abide by the decision of the University authorities."

The Senate approved of this, and caused a copy of that minute to be sent to each of those concerned, "with the view of ascertaining whether they are willing to abide by the decision of the University authorities, *i.e.*, the Senate and the University Court."

This was accordingly done, and in my reply, I said, "I confess that I do not see what reason the committee have for seeking such a pledge from me because the University Authorities who are to decide this question, either have, or have not, a legal right to enforce what regulations they see fit to make. If they possess such a right, then they do not require any consent from me, while, if they have not,

I am certainly not prepared to make over to them, or any other body, the unrestricted power to bind me by regulations which I have not had an opportunity of considering. The whole difficulty and annoyance which has arisen in connection with this clinical affair, originated from Dr. Gairdner and myself being induced to consent to the establishment of these chairs (in a manner similar to what it is now proposed to repeat) before the details connected with them were arranged and seen by us.

“I am quite prepared to sign the document *if I receive a guarantee* from the Senate that, in whatever regulations as to details they may make, they will not trench on two points which an impartial consideration of the subject will show have always remained as fundamental ones in the whole negotiations which have taken place, viz., First, That the clinical teaching shall continue, as at present, open and free, no special privileges being given to any individual, but the students allowed to choose their own teacher; and, Secondly, That the immemorial custom of the University to allow all members of the Medical Faculty to take such part as they see fit in the examinations for graduations shall not be infringed. *I beg the Committee very carefully to observe* that in urging these points I seek no selfish or personal end. *I ask no favour.* The Senate and University Court have already affirmed the first point in their arrangements with the Infirmarys, and I doubt whether they would be allowed to depart from it, if they wished to do so; while the second is a condition which it would be hard to oppose. In advancing these proposals I merely desire to guard the Medical School from a possible abuse which would be, I think, disastrous to its efficiency, and which would place it in antagonism to the liberal spirit which pervades all the schools at the present day. I desire that the assent which I may give to the action of the Authorities shall not be employed to deprive me of certain privileges which I enjoy *in common with all my colleagues*, which I highly value, and which I believe essential to the well-being of the school and my own usefulness therein.”

“I am prepared to sign any document which will promote the fuller recognition (if that is possible) of all the privileges *asked for and granted at the time of his appointment* to the Professor of Clinical Surgery. I was among the very first to respond to his wishes when he sought admission into the University and in securing for him that position and those duties *he himself asked for*. All that was sought

for by him when his chair was established is embodied in his commission. I have never failed to support his claims to the full enjoyment of all that is there expressed ; but I have ever strenuously opposed, and will continue to oppose by every means open to me, his acquiring privileges never contemplated when his chair was founded, and which if sought for *or hinted at* BEFORE his appointment would have called forth my most determined opposition. I have never ceased to claim a part in the clinical duties, and while these claims were cordially and freely admitted by Dr. Buchanan *before he was appointed*, he has ever since pertinaciously assailed them. All I ask is the fulfilment of the arrangement made when the Clinical Chairs were established, and this justice I feel confident will be conceded not less by the unwritten law of honour, than I know it would be enforced by the written law of the land. I have not a shadow of doubt but that Dr. Buchanan will at once and most gladly consent to abide by any decision come to by the University Authorities, as he knows that whatever they now grant will be a clear gain to him, *over and above what he bargained for and has got* ; but the Committee must pardon me, from whom must be taken all they might hand over to him, if I hesitate, without such a guarantee as I have named, to give my consent to an arrangement *by which I cannot possibly gain, and must certainly lose.*"

In consequence of the replies received by the Committee from myself and Dr. Gairdner, the Senate at its meeting on December 14th, 1876, resolved "to take no further steps in the matter in the meantime, and discharge the Committee."

Dr. Buchanan has made much of my declining to submit to the decision of this Committee,* and such refusal has been pointed to by him as evidence that it was I who opposed and prevented an amicable adjustment of the difficulty. An impartial consideration of the above letter will, I believe, dispel any such impression.

It will be observed that during the sessions 1874-5 and 1875-6, the Clinical Medals had been adjudged in accordance with the principles laid down by the decision of the Medical Faculty : *i.e.*, an examination was held by all the clinical teachers and the best students selected from those who presented themselves for examination. A few days before the end of the Winter Clinical Session 1876-77, when I and the students attending my class were under the full conviction that the same system was to be pursued in determining the medal for

* See Appendix, paragraph 15.

that session, I was accidentally informed that Dr. Buchanan had announced his intention *proprio motu* of adjudging University honours on his own responsibility, and to confine the selection to members of his own class (which it may be mentioned did not comprise nearly the half of the University students of Clinical Surgery). This he did in direct opposition to the decision of the Medical Faculty before quoted, and on the ground that he had protested against that decision, which he further alleged was not binding upon him as it had not been confirmed by the Senate.

Dr. Gairdner and myself accordingly wrote to the Principal the following letter:—

“DEAR PRINCIPAL CAIRD,—We regret having to trouble you, but in our official capacity, as Professors, we have to ask you to exercise your powers, as head of the University, to prevent the violation of the resolution of one of its Faculties—a copy of which decision we enclose.

“From the accompanying letter addressed by the Clerk of the Medical Faculty to one of us, you will see what has been the mind of the Medical Faculty regarding the awarding of honours to the clinical students. *That resolution has never been rescinded*, and remains the only expressed opinion of the Medical Faculty. It was passed after a long consideration of details, and without any expressed objection, except by the Professors of Clinical Medicine and Surgery, who dissented from it, and at next meeting tabled a protest—a copy of which is given by Dr. Simpson. The resolution of Medical Faculty, was, in fact, acted on, in the award of the clinical honours and medals last year, and it was only a few days ago that we discovered, quite accidentally, that the Clinical Professors had announced their intention to their respective classes to award these honours solely on their own responsibility, and to a section only of the clinical students to whom the prizes had been announced at the beginning of the session. As we had acted on the belief that the resolution of Faculty was law, and had told our students that these were the terms on which the medals, &c., were to be determined, we have been placed, by the unlooked-for action of our colleagues, in the awkward position of having apparently misinformed our respective classes on the subject, and many of our students, to their great loss and chagrin, have been deprived of the chance of competing for these honours. The Medical Faculty, as you will see from Dr. Simpson’s letter, cannot act further in the matter, but refer

it to the Senate, which again does not meet for some time, while our colleagues have stated their intention to proceed on *Friday first* to decide these prizes. Under these circumstances, *we claim that you at once interdict these gentlemen from any action in the affair till a meeting of Senate can be held.* In the meantime, and till the *minute* referred to is annulled, we have a right to demand that it be upheld by you, the proper authority, and we call for your immediate interference, so that the necessary steps be taken to suspend all irregular proceedings in the meantime.—We are, dear Principal Caird, very truly yours,

W. T. GAIRDNER,
GEO. H. B. MACLEOD."

To that letter the Principal replied that he had written to the Clinical Professors strongly disapproving of the step they were about to take and recommending them not to fulfil their intention, but he stated in his note to me, that as the resolution to which I had called his attention was one of the Medical Faculty, and not of the Senate (its confirmation by that body having been by an oversight on the part of the Secretary not sought for), he had no power to enforce it. Under these circumstances, no official steps could be taken to arrest Dr. Buchanan's action, and he accordingly, without any reference to me, adjudged, not one University medal alone, but two to the section of the students who had attended his class during the winter.*

The question of adjudging clinical medals was finally referred by the Medical Faculty to the Senate for decision, as will appear farther on.

On April 12th, 1877, the protest lodged by Dr. Gairdner and myself having been read and considered, together with the relative documents, the Senate resolved (see p. 23 of Minutes), "on the motion of Mr. Blackburn, seconded by Dr. M'Kendrick, that, in the peculiar circumstances which had emerged [*i.e.*, the medals having been actually allotted by the Clinical Professors though not handed to the students], the University should for this session give medals, to be awarded by the Clinical Professors; and on the motion of Dr. Cowan, seconded by Mr. Caird, it was agreed that medals should be given, also for this session only, to be awarded by Drs. Gairdner and Macleod, the eligibility of competitors being determined by the existing regulations." And a committee was appointed to consider how

* See Paragraph 15 in Appendix, and compare statements.

these medals were to be adjudged in future. Neither Dr. Gairdner nor myself made any use of the above permission, as we felt that to do so would make us parties to a wrongful act, and one opposed to the intimation made to the students at the outset of the session as to the manner in which these honours were to be adjudicated. It may not be amiss, however, to point out that the *parity* of the four Professors in respect of clinical teaching on behalf of the University, clearly underlies this resolution of the Senate.

On April 26th, 1877, the following minute of Senate gives the Report upon Clinical Medals: "The committee are unanimous in thinking that one of the principles in accordance with which University prizes or medals ought to be awarded may be stated as follows:—No University prize is awarded in any class to which a student who is not a matriculated student of the University may demand and obtain admission. The committee unanimously regard it as a necessary consequence of this principle that no medals or prizes can be awarded by the University in the classes for clinical teaching so long as they continue on the present footing."

The Senate ordered that the Report should lie on the table.

At this meeting, Dr. Buchanan made an application (afterwards withdrawn) to be allowed to teach Operative Surgery (one branch of my Systematic Class) within the University. This application is interesting, as showing his desire to extend his sphere beyond the department of Clinical Surgery, and especially as bearing on his evidence before the University Commission. (See paragraph No. 1 in Appendix).

On May 1st, 1877, the Clerk, having read the Report of the Committee on Clinical Medals, "moved that the Senate affirm the general principle laid down in the report, viz., That no University prize is awarded in any class to which a student, who is not a matriculated student of the University, may demand and obtain admission. This motion, having been seconded by Dr. Anderson, was agreed to. Dr. Anderson and Dr. Buchanan stated that hitherto none but matriculated students of the University had been enrolled in their classes. Mr. Ramsay then moved that so long as none but matriculated students are admitted to the classes of the Clinical Professors, clinical medals be given. Mr. Berry seconded the motion. Dr. W. P. Dickson moved as an amendment, that in the present circumstances under which clinical instruction is given, it is inexpedient to award University medals for the clinical classes. On a vote being taken,

eleven voted for the amendment, and eight for the motion, and the amendment was accordingly declared carried."

It may perhaps be necessary to state that by the regulations of the Western Infirmary, to which all the medical officers are subject, a student totally unconnected with the University has got the same right as a matriculated student of the University to enrol in the class of any teacher. It is quite beyond the power of the Clinical Professors, or any of the teachers, to reject such a student. I submitted to the Clerk of Senate an official statement to that effect from the hospital secretary.

The next phase of the controversy arose in connection with the intimation of the different classes in the Calendar and advertisements. In the Calendar for the session 1873-4 (before the appointment of the Clinical Professors) Clinical Medicine and Surgery were intimated in the Calendar, and therefore under authority of the University as being taught by the "Physicians and Surgeons of the Royal Infirmary." In that of 1874-5, *i.e.*, the first session the new Professors taught, the terms of the intimation were altered to "Physicians and Surgeons of the Western and Royal Infirmaries." In that of 1875-6, the intimation regarding Clinical Surgery was taught by "Dr. G. Buchanan and the other Surgeons of the Western and Royal Infirmaries." In 1876-7, Dr. G. Buchanan's name appears alone, but in a foot-note it is said, "The clinical lectures of the other Physicians and Surgeons of the Western and Royal Infirmaries are accepted by the University Court as qualifying for graduation." Since then various attempts have been made to have the foot-note deleted.

Most of these successive changes were made after discussions in the Medical Faculty, in which Dr. Gairdner and I, for the sake of peace, had gradually yielded everything that we thought possible or reasonable to the desire for official precedence, or rather exclusive recognition, on the part of the Clinical Professors.

On April 16th, 1877, the following minute of Senate appears — "The Report [of the Calendar Committee] was approved, and the committee were instructed to delete the note on page 45 of the Calendar 1876-7 [given above] in reference to clinical teaching." This was done without either Dr. Gairdner or myself hearing a word about it, as we were absent from that meeting, and this matter, so important to us, was carried out without giving us any information about it, or any statement appearing in the billet calling the meeting, by which any one could guess what was going to be done;

but I am not, however, on that account disposed to impute to the Calendar Committee any intention of interfering in these unhappy disputes.

On April 26, 1877, Professor Ferguson, "as Convener of the Calendar Committee, reported that the deletion of the note on page 45 of the Calendar of 1876-7, ordered by minute of Senate of date 16th April, had necessitated a change in the form of the advertisement for the summer session, but that previous to the issuing of the bill a proof had been sent to each of the Medical Professors; that Drs. Gairdner and Macleod had strongly objected to the change, and that the Calendar Committee, in consequence, now applied to the Senate for further instructions. After considerable discussion, the Senate ordered that the note be replaced in the Calendar and inserted in the bill, but with the asterisk affixed to Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery, and not to the names of the Professors. Against this decision Dr. Buchanan protested, and intimated his intention to appeal to the University Court."

This appeal I am led to understand was never made.

Further, letters from the Secretaries of the Western and Royal Infirmaries respectively on this subject were read. I may mention that it was through me that the Secretary of the Western Infirmary was made acquainted with this business. In these letters the Infirmary authorities drew the attention of the Senate to the breach of understanding which the omission of that note occasioned, and requested its reinsertion.

It may appear beyond belief, that notwithstanding the above resolution of Senate and the proceedings just referred to, the advertisements of the school in the medical journals appeared without the note, and this omission was found to be due to the action of the Convener, Dr. Buchanan, who had been left to attend to the business in the absence of his colleagues from town.

On July 31st, 1877, Dr. Gairdner drew the attention of the Senate to the renewed omission of the note referred to. The Clerk of the Senate "was directed to write to the Clerk of the Medical Faculty with a view to the Medical Faculty instructing the Committee on advertising the Medical School in no case to make any essential difference between the announcements in the Calendar and the advertisements in the public journals."

Again the same omission was repeated, and thus on 18th October we find the minute of Senate—"On the suggestion of Dr. Gairdner, the

Clerk was instructed again to bring under the notice of the Clerk of the Medical Faculty that there still existed an essential difference between the announcements in the Calendar and the advertisements of the Medical School inserted in the public journals." And on November 8th we have the minute of Senate—"The Clerk read a letter from the Clerk of the Medical Faculty, bearing that the Medical Faculty had now given the instructions to the Committee on advertising the Medical School required by minutes of Senate of date 31st July and 18th October."

When the University Commission sat, and Dr. Gairdner and myself were to appear before it, an arrangement was come to through the Principal that we were to make no allusion to the clinical difficulty, on the understanding that a like abstinence was to be observed by the Clinical Professors. After we had given our evidence, and had avoided the subject of clinical teaching, we were surprised to learn that the Clinical Professors had appeared before the Commission and given evidence regarding the questions in dispute. I immediately claimed a renewed hearing, and spoke freely on the clinical arrangements of Glasgow and the difficulties which had arisen in connection with the new chairs. That evidence is given in vol. 3 of the Report of the Commission, p. 468 and on. It is a repetition in a great measure of what is stated in these pages.

It will be noticed that by the decree of Senate given at p. 17 of printed minutes of Senate, the examinations in Surgery and in Clinical Surgery of candidates for degrees were ordered to be conducted by the Professors of Systematic and Clinical Surgery alike. On the two last occasions, however, on which the examinations in Clinical Surgery were held, as they have been all along, in the Western Infirmary and in presence of both Professors along with the non-professorial Examiner in Surgery, Dr. Buchanan assumed the whole duty, not only making the arrangements without reference to me or my convenience, but conducting the examinations with the most studied disregard of my presence. The marks given to each candidate were carefully concealed from me, and every endeavour made to impress the students with my non-connection with these examinations. This was done in the most offensive manner, and I understand that the same policy was carried out on the medical side with reference to Dr. Gairdner. It will be impossible for me to exercise the rights I possess even as a member of the Medical Faculty, founded on the immemorial usage of the University (putting aside altogether my special claims to take part

in these examinations) unless I am protected in the future against such discourteous conduct.*

During the past session the Clinical Professors have held meetings with their students on certain days within the University. Neither Dr. Gairdner or myself at first interfered in this matter, but it is a question whether *clinical* teaching can be held to cover such meetings. However this may be, it is anticipated that these proceedings have been taken in order to found some new claim not yet announced.†

On April 26th, 1877, the Clerk of Senate read the following excerpt from minute of the University Court of date 7th March, 1877, communicated by the Secretary on 25th April—"On the report of Drs. Cowan and Kirkwood with reference to the recognition of Clinical Lecturers in the Infirmarys (which has in some cases been implied rather than expressed), the Court resolved that it is inexpedient to go back upon the past, but that the practice hitherto is not to be drawn into a precedent; and that for the future such Lecturers must obtain the formal recognition of the Court and of the Chancellor, in terms of the Ordinance."

The last shape which the question at issue took was that which has called forth the appeal in connection with which this statement has been drawn up. There are printed annually in the University certain class-lists giving the names of the students attending each class, and though such lists are not published, they are yet the official authentic records of the students who have entered each class. During the two winters previous to the present, by an oversight, I did not supply any list of my clinical class, but my attention having been called to the omission by a deputation of my students, I sought to supply the omission this winter. To the printing of that list Drs. Buchanan and Anderson objected in the following note to the Clerk of Senate :—

9th February, 1878.

DEAR SIR,—As we do not think that any Professor has a right to introduce into the University Class Lists any information except what refers to the University class which he conducts, we object to the introduction in Dr. Macleod's class list of any marks or notes to indicate the attendance of students on any lectures or instruction other than that which he gives within the University

* See Appendix, paragraph 5.

† Since the above was written the Senate have withdrawn their sanction to these meetings by declining to grant the use of a class-room for the purpose.

as Professor of Systematic Surgery, the curriculum class of Surgery as specified in the ordinances.

We are, your obedient Servants,

(Signed) GEORGE BUCHANAN.
T. M'CALL ANDERSON.

It will be noticed in the foregoing letter that my right to teach Clinical Surgery as a University Professor is studiously ignored, and its import will be further explained by the following minute of Senate of date February 14th, 1878 :—

“The Clerk stated that he had received from Dr. Macleod a list of the students attending his clinical class; that Dr. Buchanan objected to any other list than his own being printed; that Dr. Macleod, at the suggestion of the Clerk, thereupon modified his proposal to the extent of not insisting upon more than having the names of the students in his clinical class indicated by a distinctive mark in the Surgery class list; and that Drs. Buchanan and Anderson had lodged formal written objection to any marks of the kind being inserted in the Surgery class list. In these circumstances, the Clerk applied to the Senate for instructions. After statements from Drs. Macleod and Buchanan, Dr. Young moved, that inasmuch as students who are not matriculated students of the University may demand and obtain admission to any of the clinical classes—no clinical class list be printed. Dr. Cleland seconded the motion. At this point, the Principal having to leave the meeting, Dr. W. P. Dickson was appointed chairman. Mr. Blackburn moved as an amendment that, without pronouncing an opinion on any legal question involved, the Senate instruct the Clerk to follow the procedure of last year. This was seconded by Mr. Caird. On a division, four voted for the motion and five for the amendment. Seven members abstained from voting. The amendment was accordingly declared carried. Dr. Macleod protested, and appealed to the University Court for himself and those who might adhere to him.”

February 21st, 1878. — “The minutes of last meeting being read, Dr. Gairdner intimated his adherence to Dr. Macleod's protest and appeal. Mr. Blackburn and Mr. Caird were appointed to defend the judgment of the Senate.”

It will be observed that in the decision of Senate above referred to a mere fraction of the Senate voted,—in fact, not a quorum of the

Senate; and it may be stated that as Drs. Buchanan and Anderson were both present, and Dr. Gairdner was necessarily absent on urgent professional duty, the members voting on either side (leaving out of account the Professors directly concerned) were equal in number. Further, the decision, if confirmed, will render the University records misleading, for the majority of the surgical-clinical students of this winter session are members of my class, and have not attended Dr. Buchanan at all during this winter session (their choice of a teacher being left by the Infirmary regulations entirely free). The lists will thus exclude fifty-five matriculated University students who have the same right to the recognition of the University as those who have formed Dr. Buchanan's class.

Lastly, The exclusion of my clinical class list is a direct infringement of that equality in regard to clinical teaching which this statement has shown it has been the whole intention of the Senate to establish, and practically reduces me to the position aimed at by Dr. Buchanan, viz., that of an extra-mural teacher. But Dr. Buchanan, in his evidence before the Commission (see Appendix, No. 7), has shown that even this will not content him, for he there signifies a wish to have me extruded from the clinical teaching altogether, so far as graduation purposes are concerned. Compare this with his letter on page 9, in which he pleaded with me to support his admission to the University, and professed himself satisfied with an equal amount with me "of wards, work, and fees."

Such is a summary of the whole question; but it may be useful to add, that any weakening of the position of the Professor of Surgery in connection with the clinical business of the school must re-act disastrously on the interests of the University, and that the object contemplated by the establishment of a chair of Clinical Surgery (that of doubling the University Professors engaged in hospital teaching) would not only not be attained, but such an element of discord would be introduced into the school as could not fail in the long-run to be attended with the most pernicious effects. It is essential to the teacher of Surgery to have the amplest means "of illustrating practically," to quote the apt words of Dr. Buchanan in the afterwards discarded paragraph, "the doctrines which he teaches in his class-room," and such opportunities are provided in every school at home and abroad. Everywhere, except in Edinburgh (where from exceptional circumstances, well known to the professor,

a peculiar state of affairs has been established),* clinical teaching is perfectly free; and in the English schools where chairs of Clinical Surgery exist, the Professor of Surgery has precisely the same privileges in connection with the clinical work as those who have the title of Professor of Clinical Surgery. In some schools the chairs are conjoined.

In conclusion, I must add that since the foregoing statement was drawn up, a further infraction of the regulations laid down by the hospital authorities has occurred through the action of the Clinical Professors. On November 5th, 1877, the following notice was posted on the hospital board, and a copy sent to each of the teachers:—

“NOTICE TO STUDENTS—CLINICAL PRIZES.

“The Managers have adopted the following resolution:—That the Managers of the Western Infirmary give each year a Medical Clinical Medal and a Surgical Clinical Medal; also honorary first-class certificates to the extent of ten per cent. of the students engaged in the competition, these prizes and certificates to be open for competition to the whole of the students attending the Western Infirmary.

“Regulations for the competition to be framed by the Medical and Surgical staff, subject to the approval of the Managers. No other prizes or honorary distinctions to be given in connection with the clinical classes in the Western Infirmary.”

“By order of the Managers.

(Signed) “JOHN ALEXANDER, M.D.,
“*Superintendent.*”

A meeting of the staff was called, at which neither of the Clinical Professors appeared, but at the adjourned meeting Dr. Anderson was present. Then a resolution was come to as to the mode of carrying out the above decision of the Managers, and in February the following notice was published, which embodies that resolution:—

“WESTERN INFIRMARY MEDALS IN CLINICAL MEDICINE
AND SURGERY.

“These are to be awarded at the end of the Summer Session after a competition open to all students attending the Western Infirmary, with the exception only (1) of any who may hold qualifications in

* See account of this, derived from authentic sources, in my evidence before the Commission, question 11,503.

Medicine or Surgery; and (2) of any who hold, or have held, the office of Resident Assistant in the Western Infirmary.

“Names to be given in to the Superintendent by the first week of July.

“HONORARY CERTIFICATES IN CLINICAL MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

“These are to be awarded at the end of the Summer Session. They are open to all those who have attended one or more courses of Clinical Medicine or Surgery respectively, during the previous nine months.

(Signed) “JOHN ALEXANDER, M.D.,
“*Superintendent.*”

On Friday, March 28th, the Professors of Clinical Medicine and Surgery met their classes in the College, and announced the names of those students who had attained distinction in their respective classes, in utter disregard of the regulations above quoted.

On Tuesday, April 2nd, after long discussion, the Senate withdrew the permission formerly given the Clinical Professors to use a classroom in the University. Dr. Buchanan appealed to the University Court, but has, I understand, decided not to prosecute that appeal, and steps have been taken to bring the breach of their regulations before the notice of the Board of Directors of the Western Infirmary.

A P P E N D I X.

The attention of the Members of the University Court is particularly requested to the following excerpts from the evidence given by Drs. Buchanan and Anderson before the Universities Commission. Care has been taken to include all the points which specially bear on the questions in dispute, and to give the context in each instance. The italics are Dr. Macleod's.

It will be observed (paragraphs 5-10 and 15) that the Clinical Professors carried their appeal to the Commissioners, in the hope that they would legislate on the disputed points. The following are the conclusions come to by the Commission regarding the subject:—

Page 51, vol. I.

In Glasgow two professorships have been instituted by the University,—viz., a professorship of Clinical Surgery, and a professorship of Clinical Medicine, both in 1874. An endowment of £2500 was provided from private sources for each of these chairs, and the patronage has been vested in the University Court. The chair in each case was instituted by the *Senatus Academicus*, with the approval of the University Court, and intimation of the foundation was made to the Home Secretary. In each case the minute of Senate embodying the resolution to institute the chair, declared it to be the duty of the Professor to teach Clinical Surgery (or Medicine) by means of lectures and other instruction, and embodied, at the same time, a condition that this was to be “without prejudice to the claims of the other Professors in the Faculty of Medicine to similar teaching.” What are the relative rights of the two Clinical Professors, and of the other members of the Medical Faculty, under the institution of the new chairs with this reservation, has, as the evidence shows, formed, and still forms, a subject of controversy in the

University. The differences between the holders of the Clinical chairs on the one hand, and some of their Medical colleagues on the other, particularly the Professors of the Practice of Medicine and Systematic Surgery, relate to the questions whether clinical lectures given at the Infirmary by the Systematic Professors are to be accepted as qualifying courses in Clinical Medicine and Surgery for University degrees equally with those given by the Clinical Professors, and, if so, on what conditions; what are the relative rights of the different Professors in conducting the examinations in Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery of candidates for degrees; by whom University honours to the students attending the clinical classes shall be awarded, and to other matters affecting the rights or interests of the two classes of Professors. The opposing views entertained on these subjects of dispute were fully brought before us, but we have no authority to settle the differences between the parties, and we abstain from expressing an opinion on the merits of them. They fall within the class of questions which, as we have explained, we think the University Court ought to have authority to determine. It is unfortunate that such differences should be allowed to continue. Their existence shows the necessity of caution in the foundation of new professorships, and in particular the importance of seeing that the relative positions of those who are to hold proposed new chairs and the incumbents of existing chairs are well ascertained before new professorships are instituted.

Page 64, vol. I.

We have been pressed, by some gentlemen interested in the Faculty of Medicine, to recommend the institution of a separate chair of Clinical Medicine in Edinburgh. They represent it as desirable that there should be some one professor whose duty it is to give to the students clinical instruction in Medicine, as is now the case in regard to Surgery. A different view, however, has been expressed to us by many witnesses, to the effect that the present arrangement is preferable, under which *any of the medical Professors in Edinburgh who please teach clinically in the Infirmary*. By this arrangement, it is said the Professors have the advantage of illustrating their teaching in the class by reference to actual cases seen by the students, and the students are also benefited by having experience of the practice of different physicians. Without deciding between these opposite views, we do not think sufficient ground has been shown for the institution

of a separate chair of Clinical Medicine. *The present arrangement has lasted for many years, and has been attended with success. No difficulty has been experienced in finding several of the Professors ready to give clinical instruction, and, if any such difficulty were likely to arise, a remedy might be found in making it the duty of certain of the Professors. The embarrassment which has arisen in Glasgow from the foundation of the clinical chairs there, discourages us from recommending that there should be any alteration in the system which has worked well in Edinburgh.*

SATURDAY, 3rd February, 1877—(*Fifty-Fifth Day*).

Professor BUCHANAN, examined.

No. 1, page 283.

9804. *The Chairman*.—Is operative surgery imperative as a class in the curriculum at present?—It is not. It is not in the Ordinances.

9805. Do you think it should be?—I don't think it should be for M.B. I would leave it open to the student to get his information in operative surgery where he chose, but I would make an examination in operative surgery imperative for C.M.

9806. You would allow him to get it either in the University or from an extra-mural teacher?—Wherever he chose, and by whatever means.

9807. *Mr. Campbell*.—It is not imperative now?—It is not.

9808. But it is usually taken as a subject of examination?—The practice has come to make it a part of the examination with the sanction of the Medical Faculty. It has come to be adopted as part of the surgical examination.

9809. *The Chairman*.—Have you any remark to make as to the department to which the teaching, fees, and examination for degrees should be attached?—*If in the Ordinance or enactment operative surgery should be made an imperative course, the question must arise, who is to teach it; and I would suggest that it should be made a part of the duty of the clinical chair, and not of the theoretical chair.*

No. 2, page 284.

9810. *The Chairman*.—Do the professors whom you call the theoretical professors teach clinically?—At present they do.

9811. In the Hospital?—If they happen to be surgeons to the Infirmary.

9812. It depends upon that accident?—It does.

9813. Then if they were not surgeons to the Infirmary, and your chair had not been instituted, would there be no teaching of clinical surgery at all?—Not in connection with the University.

9814. That would be one of the branches that students would be obliged to take extra-murally?—*Yes; as it was before the foundation of the clinical chairs.*

9815. *Dr. Muir.*—Are you a surgeon of the Infirmary too?—Yes.

9816. That is quite independent of the University?—It is not quite independent of the University.

9817. *The Chairman.*—But you are appointed by a different body, are you not?—Yes; *but there is in the Constitution of the Infirmary a clause by which the managers agree to provide for the clinical teaching of the Professor (sic) in the University.*

9818. But before your chair was instituted, clinical teaching was sometimes given by the Professor of Systematic Surgery, who in that case would have to teach in the Infirmary?—Yes; but the Infirmary in regard to which that charter or condition existed was not then built.

9819. You are speaking of the charter of the new Infirmary?—Yes.

9820. Therefore by that clause in the charter ample provision is made for clinical teaching in connection with the University, from the fact that the University professor (*sic*) must be made by them a clinical teacher?—Yes.

9821. *Mr. Campbell.*—There are other clinical teachers in the Infirmary as well as professors?—Yes.

9822. What are the precise terms of the constitution of the Infirmary with regard to the professors?—The clause is as follows:—*‘The managers shall annually elect such medical officers as may be required for the efficient treatment of the patients in the Western Infirmary, it being understood that such reasonable provision as is deemed necessary by the Senatus of the University of Glasgow and the Managers shall be made for the professors of the University engaged in clinical instruction.’*

No. 3, page 285.

9834. *The Chairman.*—What advantage do you anticipate from clinical teaching being adopted by different men from those who teach

the same subject systematically in the University?—There are two special advantages; the one is, that it secures the whole attention of a lecturer to a branch that needs a great deal of care, to the exclusion of his time being occupied otherwise in teaching; and second, that it secures to the students of the University the opportunity of being taught upon the same subject, but in a different aspect, by two different men. I may refer to Mr. Lister's chair in Edinburgh.

9835. There being a Professor of Clinical Surgery distinct from the Professor of Systematic Surgery?—Yes.

9836. Would you make attendance on these clinical professors compulsory?—I would scarcely like to give an off-hand opinion on that subject; but I would make it the same as in the case of other professors.

9837. You see some difficulty?—Yes; *with regard to the present incumbents of the systematic chairs.*

No. 4, page 286.

9847. *The Chairman.*—What is the amount of endowment of your own chair?—£110.

9848. *Dr. Muir.*—By whom granted?—The foundation. There is a foundation.

9849. *The Chairman.*—The funds were provided from private sources?—Yes.

9850. *By a number of persons?*—Yes.

9851. *Dr. Muir.*—Was the chair established by the University Court without the intervention of Government?—Government was informed of it. The Lord Advocate was communicated with, and it was founded, I understand, by the University authorities—Government being a consenting party.

No. 5, page 287.

9878. *The Chairman.*—Is there any other point on which you have any remarks to make, or have you anything to add to what you have already said?—There is just one subject, on which I would not give an opinion, but I suggest it for consideration. I mean the share to be taken by the different professors in the examinations for degrees. At present it is left open to the whole examining board, including the professors and the extra-professorial staff, to divide the duties between them as they think best themselves. Practically that is sometimes attended with difficulty, and I would suggest that the

Commissioners should consider to what extent the duty should be appropriated to the different professors and examiners.

9879. You mean what proportions should be necessarily performed by the professors themselves, and what by the non-professorial examiners?—Not only that, but what amount in the examination each professor should take.

9880. But, practically, does not each professor examine in his own department?—Not altogether.

9881. And it is done by private arrangement among themselves?—There is no statement in the Ordinances at all except that the board shall be so-and-so. It is left free.

9882. *Dr. Muir.*—Do you mean that medical professors examine on surgical matters and *vice versa*?—No, I don't mean that; but some professors take a greater share in the examination than others.

9883. *Mr. Campbell.*—Do you think it would be practicable to define by Ordinance what each examiner should do? Do you think that what you have suggested for the consideration of the Commissioners is a thing that could practically be done?—I think so.

9884. *The Chairman.*—You don't think it would be tying down or restricting professors too much to make rules of that kind?—While doing so, it might be left open for any professor to attend any examination as a witness or visitor.

9885. What special advantage would you expect from laying down rules on that subject?—Sometimes it is quite possible for one professor to take a larger share in the examination than another.

9886. Is that from the over zeal of the one or the want of zeal of the other?—Not from the want of zeal on the part of those who restrict themselves to the subjects of their chairs, but perhaps from—let us *call* it over zeal.

[The italics are Dr. Buchanan's.]

9887. Over zeal on the part of one and looseness on the part of the other?—No.

9888. Or modesty—diffidence?—I would not say that.

9889. Is there any other point that you would like to speak to?—I think not.

Professor M'CALL ANDERSON, examined. [3rd Feby., 1877.]

No. 6, page 295.

9995. *The Chairman.*—Have you anything else to state?—There is just one thing I wish to say, and it is this, that while I do not ap-

prove of the principle of professors competing with one another, I should not be inclined to insist upon the present Professors of Medicine and of Surgery being prevented from competing with the Professors of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery, if these gentlemen do not invade *our other privileges*. I think they might be allowed to continue to give courses on clinical medicine and surgery, provided the principle were laid down that it was not to occur again.

9996. Why, if it is a bad thing in itself?—*Before these chairs were founded they were engaged in clinical teaching, and it might be hard, now that the chairs are founded, to prevent them from continuing what they had done before.* I think it might be a fair thing to allow them to continue to do it, provided the principle is laid down that in future professors are not to compete with one another by giving qualifying tickets in other than their own subjects.

9997. Before the establishment of the clinical chairs, they gave qualifying tickets?—Yes, everybody did. I gave them too. We were all physicians and surgeons in the Royal Infirmary previous to the foundation of those chairs, and we all gave lectures, and all our tickets were accepted. But a totally different state of matters must prevail when the University founds chairs of Clinical Medicine and Surgery.

9998. *Mr. Campbell.*—Have the Professors of Medicine and Surgery any pecuniary interest in the giving of qualifying tickets?—Yes, they get fees.

9999. What fees?—We have not been paid that yet. They will probably get a guinea and a half for each student who comes to them for three months; if a student comes for six months they will probably get three guineas,—*fees which otherwise would, for the most part, go to the clinical professors.*

10,000. You mean as their proportion from the Western Infirmary?—Yes. I think probably the directors of the Western Infirmary will give three guineas for the winter session and two guineas for the summer session; and if a student takes one physician or surgeon for the whole six months, that would give him three guineas for the session. All these fees are added to the fees which the Professor of Surgery now gets, and it is very probable that the fees which he receives this winter for clinical teaching will exceed the whole fees received by the Professor of Clinical Surgery, or be equal to them.*

* See p. 18 of Narrative.

10,001. *The Chairman*.—And that they will receive in addition?—In addition to the emoluments which I have mentioned.

10,002. Anything else?—I think not.

FRIDAY, 30th March, 1877—(*Sixty-Fifth Day*).

Professor GEORGE BUCHANAN, examined.

No. 7, page 477.

11,506. *The Chairman*.—We understand that you wish to make some additions to the evidence which you formerly gave?—Yes.

11,507. What statement do you wish to make?—The clinical chairs should have the same position as the chair of Clinical Surgery in the University of Edinburgh,—that is, the professors and their students should have all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the other professors and their students. *They should have the exclusive right to the term "University," as applied to their students, courses of lectures, class tickets, certificates of attendance, and certificates of proficiency. They should have the exclusive right to award the University medals and class honours to the students attending their lectures. They should have the exclusive right among the University professors to give the qualifying courses of clinical lectures as specified in the Ordinances.* The clinical professors should have the special duty of conducting, along with the examiner appointed by the Court, the clinical examinations for graduation,—just as the Professor of Anatomy conducts the examination in anatomy. This would not interfere with the systematic Professor of Surgery being a surgeon to the Infirmary, and illustrating his college lectures by cases in his wards to students who may visit his wards—also by his operations; but it would not entitle him to compete with his University colleague in giving the qualifying course of clinical lectures; as is the case with Professor Spence in Edinburgh.

No. 8, page 478.

11,508. *The Chairman*.—What students can claim to be called University students, except those who are taught by University professors?—None; but the Professor of Surgery and the Professor of the Practice of Medicine still *resist the claim* of the clinical professors to be the only clinical professors in the University.

11,509. They resist the exclusive claims of the clinical professors?—Yes; *which, we think, are involved in our appointment.*

No. 9, page 478.

11,510. *The Chairman*.—Does Professor Spence, in Edinburgh, give a qualifying course?—No; he visits the wards and operates, but he does not compete with Professor Lister in giving the qualifying lectures. Dr. Macleod is Professor of Surgery, and I am Professor of Clinical Surgery in the University of Glasgow. If it be said that the systematic professor has hitherto given lectures on clinical surgery, it must be remembered—first, that formerly there was no clinical professor to do the duty; second, the systematic professor did not give clinical lectures *ex officio*, but only as surgeon to the Infirmary when he happened to have that office, which was only occasionally;* third, without that, the systematic professor already has the monopoly in the University of more courses and fees† than any other professor in the University, except the Professor of Anatomy, who devotes his whole time to the duties of his chair, while the Professor of Surgery only meets his systematic class one hour a day. Each student who passes through the University attends the systematic professor as follows ‡:—

Lectures on Surgery, 1st session,	-	-	Fee 3 guineas.
Lectures on Surgery, 2nd session,	-	-	Fee 2 guineas.
Operative Surgery, - - - - -	-	-	Fee 2 guineas.

The last two courses are not enjoined in the Ordinances, and are *called*

[The italics are Dr. Buchanan's.]

optional; but the second course of lectures is really imperative, because the professor divides his lectures into two sections, § each of which he gives in alternate sessions; and the operative course is necessary, because all candidates for degrees are examined in operative surgery. Besides the above courses, for which he obtains seven guineas from each student, the systematic professor *is now claiming* to share with the clinical professor the lectures and fees in clinical surgery. The Professor of Systematic Surgery should not be allowed to share with the clinical professor the duty of conducting the clinical examinations of candidates for degrees, because the systematic professor already has a greater share than any other professor in the examination of candidates for degrees. Along with the surgical examiner appointed by the Court, he submits each candidate to three

* See p. 20 of Narrative.

† See Table of Emoluments, Report of Commission, vol. IV., p. 166.

‡ This is quite inaccurate.

§ He does not, and never did.

separate examinations, viz.:—1. A written examination in surgery; 2. An oral examination in surgery; 3. An examination in operative surgery. Besides these, he claims to have a share, along with the clinical professor, in the clinical examination.

No. 10, p. 478.

11,511. *The Chairman*.—Before you were appointed, was there any clinical surgery taught in the University?—*Not in the University.*

11,512. *Or in connection with the University?*—*None.*

11,513. *Was there no clinical teaching at all?*—*No clinical teaching connected with the University, ex officio, but the Royal Infirmary was open to any surgeon that the directors elected, professor or not.*

11,514. Is that not still the case?—Yes, the Infirmarys are open; but we claim as professors to have the right of giving the qualifying courses of lectures.

11,515. There were examinations in clinical surgery before you were appointed?—There were.

11,516. And the only instruction that was given in it then was by the surgeons of the Infirmary, whether University professors or not?—Quite so. There are now six other surgeons in the Infirmarys of Glasgow who compete with me besides Dr. Macleod.

11,517. None of their classes of course qualify for the University examination?—They do; but by the Ordinances they ought to be recognised by the University Court.

11,518. Then it seems to be the custom of the Glasgow University to accept the certificates of everybody that chooses to lecture?—Yes; in the case of clinical lectures.

11,519. *Sir William Stirling-Maxwell*.—Do you mean that as soon as a surgeon obtains that position, they do it without his making a personal application?—Hitherto that has been the case.

11,520. *The Chairman*.—Has this question which has occurred between the new and the old professors been the subject of discussion in the Senatus?—Yes.

11,521. Has the Senatus come to any resolution on the subject?—In May, 1876, a Committee of Senate was appointed to report on the position of the clinical chairs, with a view to settle the points of difference between the systematic and clinical professors. Before commencing their inquiries they desired to have a written acknowledgment from the Professors of Medicine and Surgery and the clinical

professors that they would abide by the decision of the University authorities on the matter. The clinical professors gave such written obligation; the systematic professors refused to do so. Hence the appeal to the University Commissioners.

No. 11, page 479.

11,522. *Dr. Muir.*—Had you and Dr. Gairdner and Dr. Macleod any conversation on the subject now at issue between you, and did you come to any arrangement privately with them?—*When it became probable that** I would be the first clinical professor, Dr. Macleod *in a letter to me* stated that there were certain stipulations which he meant to insist upon before he consented to the institution of the chair. *I replied* that, so far as I was personally concerned, I was willing to agree to these proposals with Dr. Macleod as an individual; *but I stated to him that he must make these proposals to the Senate, and not to me, and that I was content to abide by the decision of the Senate upon the matter.*†

11,523. *The Chairman.*—And no further agreement has been come to between you?—No further agreement except an understanding which I gave him that I was willing *that for his tenure of office* he should share the duties and fees connected with the teaching of clinical surgery; *but I distinctly stated that he must make his proposal to the Senate, and I would act as the Senate decided.*

11,524. Do I misrepresent you when I say that *your evidence seems to me to amount to this, that the two systematic professors, although they may be appointed medical officers to the Infirmarys, are to be the only men so appointed whom the University Court are not to acknowledge as giving qualifying lectures in clinical surgery or medicine?*—If any other physician or surgeon to the Infirmarys conducts another extra-academical course corresponding with the systematic lectures of Dr. Macleod and Dr. Gairdner, he should not be allowed to compete in another subject. Each teacher or professor should select his subject and devote his energies to it, as is the rule in the University of Edinburgh in reference to surgery, where the professors are not allowed to give qualifying courses upon two subjects, and where

* See note to page 10 of Narrative.

† No such statement was ever made to me, nor did I ever hear of it till I read it here. The only letter I then received from Dr. Buchanan is given at p. 9 of Narrative.

no extra-academical teacher on surgery is allowed to give more than one qualifying course.*

11,525. *Dr. Muir*.—How many qualifying courses can they give in Glasgow?—The University at present accepts certificates for clinical lectures from physicians and surgeons in the Infirmaries, without reference to what other subjects they may teach.

11,526. *The Chairman*.—There is no rule in Glasgow of the kind which you say exists in Edinburgh?—No; but the Ordinances specify that “no attendance on lectures by a private teacher shall be reckoned, if the teacher gives instruction in more than one of the prescribed branches of study; except in those cases where the professors of the University are at liberty to teach more than one branch.”

11,527. And your contention really is for the establishment of such a rule?—It is, by defining the privilege of the clinical professors.

No. 12, page 480.

11,528. *The Chairman*.—Has this matter ever come before the University Court?—It has.

11,529. With what result?—At the commencement of session 1875, Dr. Macleod began his clinical course by a lecture, in which he stated that as Professor of Surgery in the University he performed one-half of his function in the University and the other half in the Infirmary. and that the one was the supplement of the other. I brought the matter before the Court in consequence of this published lecture, and the Court asked Dr. Macleod to explain himself. *He explained it away by saying that he did not mean to assert that the lectures which he gave in the Infirmary were a part of his duty as the Professor of Surgery*, and in consequence of that assertion my application was dismissed, and the Court came to no finding.

11,530. *Dr. Muir*.—Can you put in a printed copy of Dr. Macleod's lecture?—I can.

No. 13, page 480.

11,533. *The Chairman*.—You suggested that the Professor of Surgery, although he was not to be entitled to give the qualifying course.

* See account in my evidence before Commission as regards Chair of Clinical Surgery in Edinburgh. The Professor of Medicine as well as the Professor of Pathology are recognised in Edinburgh as clinical teachers for graduation purposes. See also p. 46 of Appendix.

might illustrate his lectures to students in the Infirmary. You think there would be no difficulty about that?—*None.*

11,534. *Would any students attend him?—Every operating day the theatre would be full. And he has the opportunity before and after each operation of explaining the case precisely as any other surgeon has; and at times, when the other surgeons are not engaged with all the students, the students might go into his wards and see the patients. As an illustration, I may refer to the practice of Professor Spence, who is followed by crowds of students in the Infirmary of Edinburgh, and his ward visits are immensely valued by the students.*

No. 14, p. 481.

11,536. *The Chairman.*—Is there any dispute between you and the systematic Professor on the subject of awarding the prizes in Clinical Surgery?—I should like specially to call attention to that. As Clinical Professor, I claim the same right as any other Professor in the University to award the University Medal and class honours to the students attending my lectures; and an opinion on that subject was given by Professor Berry in May, 1875, at the request of the Medical Faculty, from which I may read the following extract:—“Perhaps I may be allowed to add, although the point is of minor importance, and it is not one in regard to which there is properly any question of legal right, that it seems to me only fair that the medals in Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery should be awarded by the Professors of these branches. I think the special position as Clinical Professors, which they undoubtedly hold, gives them a just claim to that privilege.” But that is resisted at the present moment in a way that I shall now state. Last session, 1875-76, in consequence of *the anomalous position of clinical teaching*,* a student did not attend the lectures of one teacher, but attended on Tuesday with me, and another day with Dr. Macleod or another surgeon, so that the course was a joint course. I submitted to the medal being awarded by taking the opinion of Dr. Macleod with reference to the conduct of the students upon the one day, while I gave my opinion with reference to their conduct on the other day. *At the end of the session the dissatisfaction was so great* that I announced to the students that I would not submit to similar interference in future. This session, in consequence of a new action of the Infirmary managers, each surgeon has a class of his own; my students attend me, and attend no other person. In con-

* This was the arrangement made by the Senate. See p. 18 of Minutes.

sequence of Dr. Macleod and Dr. Gairdner *refusing to recognise the authority of the Senate*, formerly referred to (11,521), my clinical colleague and I determined to act upon the opinion of Mr. Berry, and upon a minute of the Medical Faculty of date 6th November, 1875, to the effect that those students only who attend the lectures of the clinical professors for a period of not less than three months shall be entitled to compete for the University medals and certificates of merit.* I therefore determined this session to assert my privilege as clinical professor to award the clinical medals.

No. 15, p. 481.

11,540. *Dr. Muir.*—And, in consequence of your decision, have the medals been placed at your disposal by the University?—In consequence of Dr. Macleod *refusing to submit it to the decision of the Senate and Court* (11,521), and in consequence of Mr. Berry's opinion that we had the right to give the medal, I decided this year to do it on my own responsibility. On Saturday last Drs. Macleod and Gairdner brought the matter before the Medical Faculty; the chairman *ruled that it was not competent*, and the matter dropped. On Tuesday last Dr. Macleod asked his students to remain in his classroom after the lecture, and announced to them that he had heard that I intended to award the University medals to those students only who had attended me the whole session; the result of which was, that the students met, appointed a committee to consider my action. A deputation came to me and told me what had been done. In consequence, I read the *minute* that I have read to-day (11,536), and the result was that they went next day,—on Wednesday last—to Dr. Macleod and informed him that they were satisfied; and this morning I awarded the clinical medals and gave the certificates of merit. But Dr. Macleod wrote a private note to the Principal last night asking him to interfere and prevent me doing this. It was too late; the medal was awarded, my certificates were sealed up and addressed to the students. *And I ask the University Commissioners to say whether my action is not a proper one for a man to whose care is committed the first incumbency of a chair, the privileges of which and the responsibility of which he is bound to support and maintain.*

11,541. Have you anything further to *state*?—No.

* See p. 24, where the final decision of the Medical Faculty is given.

Professor M'CALL ANDERSON, examined.

No. 16, p. 482.

11,542. *The Chairman*.—I understand that you are anxious to make some additions to your former evidence?—*I wish, in the first place, to withdraw a statement which I made at the close of my former evidence. I said that I had no desire to interfere with the present Professors of Medicine and Surgery in giving courses on clinical medicine and clinical surgery in competition with the clinical professors, provided it was distinctly understood that no future professor was to be allowed to do the same.* But I wish to withdraw that statement now, because I find that matters are getting more complicated every day, and things have occurred even within the last few days which render it very undesirable that such a state of matters should continue.

11,543. Is not the University Court the proper authority to terminate any such intra-University struggles?—The University Court seems to have a delicacy in interfering in a matter where the interests of professors in the University are supposed to be specially involved.

11,544. *Dr. Muir*.—Did not the University Court establish the two new chairs?—Yes.

11,545. Therefore it would seem to be their duty to regulate everything connected with them?—We have been professors for three years now, and they don't seem to have been able as yet to alter matters in the slightest degree.

11,546. *The Chairman*.—The point has never been by any of you formally brought before the University Court?—Some months ago I asked for the appointment of a committee of the Senate to consider the whole matter, and to get all the differences settled. Dr. Buchanan and I, the clinical professors, agreed to abide by the decision of this committee provided the Professors of Medicine and Surgery would agree to do the same. The Professors of Medicine and Surgery refused to come under any such obligation, and the consequence was that the Committee of Senate was dissolved, so that we are in exactly the same position now as we were the day we were appointed.

No. 17, p. 483.

11,551. And the only persons you think ought not to compete with you are the Professors of Systematic Medicine and Surgery?—Any

professors in the University. Any person who is a professor in the same University should not give a qualifying course on the same subject as his colleagues,—in the same way as I should consider it wrong to give a course of lectures on the practice of medicine in competition with Dr. Gairdner, because he is a colleague of my own, and I ask the same from him.

11,552. And even with reference to the extra-mural teachers who are qualified, you would think it wrong—probably illegal,—that the same man should be recognised in two separate departments?—I would; but that is a peculiarity in Glasgow. They do recognise them in two departments. In Edinburgh there is a rule that an extra-academical teacher can only be recognised in one subject, but in Glasgow it seems, whether legally or not I don't know, they recognise them in more than one subject.

No. 18, p. 483.

11,553. Then, according to the Glasgow practice, the lectures of one extra-academical teacher may be accepted as qualifying for two departments?—Apparently so.

11,554. But you maintain that that rule ought not to extend to professors, that because a man is a professor he is to be put to a disadvantage in that respect?—I would not say that. I say that if a man is a professor, while that gives him certain privileges, it should entail upon him certain restrictions. If the Professor of Medicine is to be entitled to give a course of lectures in practice of medicine and a qualifying ticket in practice of medicine, and also to give a course of lectures in clinical medicine and a qualifying ticket on clinical medicine, surely, in common fairness, I ought to be allowed to give a course in practice of medicine, and compete with him. But if I were to apply to the University Court to be allowed to give a course of lectures on practice of medicine, I should be refused at once; so that it is perfectly unjust.

No. 19, p. 483.

11,555. *Dr. Muir.*—Did Dr. Buchanan and you endeavour to arrive at any understanding privately with Dr. Gairdner and Dr. Macleod before the arrangements regarding your chairs were completed?—I think I had better answer that in this way, that I came under no obligation to Dr. Gairdner in the matter; and I think it

only fair to Dr. Gairdner to say that he never asked me to come under any obligation to him.* Indeed, I should consider it a grave impropriety on the part of any professor to make use of his position to extort terms from a candidate for another chair as the price of his not opposing him ; and I have yet to learn that the affairs of a great national institution, such as the University of Glasgow, are to be regulated by private arrangements or private agreements, rather than by what is most conducive to the welfare of the University, and of the public for whom the University exists.

No. 20, p. 484.

11,556. *The Chairman*.—There was, I suppose, clinical teaching in the University before the clinical chairs were instituted?—Before the clinical chairs were instituted all the clinical teaching took place in the Royal Infirmary.

11,557. And it still takes place in the Royal Infirmary?—No, there are now two infirmaries. All the physicians and surgeons of the old Infirmary gave clinical lectures, and were recognised,—Dr. Buchanan and I among the number. But when the Western Infirmary was opened, the University students migrated to the Western Infirmary, and their clinical teaching took place there.

11,558. But before you were appointed professors, you were, as clinical teachers, just in the same position that the two systematic professors are?—Certainly.

11,559. And your contention is, that, you having been appointed clinical professors, their right to teach clinically, or at least to have their tickets recognised as clinical teachers, ought to cease?—I have not the slightest objection to their teaching clinically as much as they like, by which I mean going round their wards with as many students as care to go with them, examining the patients, treating them, and making any remarks upon them they like. Clinical lecturing is what Dr. Buchanan and I are bound to undertake—namely, to give two lectures every week in a lecture-room, which is a distinct thing altogether. We want to prevent them giving a qualifying course of lectures, but we don't wish to prevent them teaching clinically.

11,560. Do you think the students would attend their clinical instructions as well as yours if yours were alone to qualify?—I think I can best answer that question by referring to the case of Edinburgh,

* Dr. Gairdner will have something to say as to the accuracy of this in his statement.

where Professor Spence, the Professor of Surgery, teaches clinical surgery, but is not allowed to give a qualifying course of clinical surgery; I understand he has a very large following of students.

11,561. *Dr. Muir.*—In the Infirmary?—Yes.

11,562. But Dr. Gairdner and Dr. Macleod don't wish to lecture in the lecture-room on clinical medicine and clinical surgery, do they?—Yes, they do, that is their whole contention. They want to be allowed to give two qualifying tickets,—in practice of medicine and in surgery, and, in addition, on clinical medicine and clinical surgery, competing with the professors specially appointed to teach these subjects.

11,563. *The Chairman.*—They had the power of doing that before you were appointed?—Yes.

11,564. And your contention is that your appointment ought to have the effect of depriving them of that power?—Of the power of giving qualifying lectures.

11,565. And they very naturally contend the reverse?—They contend the reverse.

No. 21, p. 485.

11,567. I suppose your contention also is that you have the exclusive right to award University prizes in that department?—Certainly; and it is one of the many results of allowing our colleagues to compete with us, that *they are not content with merely competing with us, but insist on claiming a share in the whole of our privileges*, including the giving of honours.

11,570. Does that exhaust what you have to say?—That is only one thing that they claim. They claim everything else. For instance, to-morrow morning the clinical examinations begin; Drs. Gairdner and Macleod will be certain to come to these clinical examinations, and take part in them in addition to conducting their examinations in systematic medicine and surgery.

11,571. They did that before you were appointed?—Somebody had to do it.